

JPRS-TAC-85-067

19 December 1985

Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

19 December 1985

# WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

### CONTENTS

#### SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR Hits U.S. Officials on SDI (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 27 Nov 85; Moscow TASS International Service, 3 Dec 85).....	1
Gen Abrahamson Cited	1
Regan, Gen Rowney Cited	2
TASS: U.S. Corporations Reaping Profits From Arms Race (Moscow TASS, 2 Dec 85).....	4
USSR Notes Varying Opinions on W. European Participation (Various sources, various dates).....	6
French Defense Minister Cited	6
Evolution of UK Policy	6
Thatcher, Kohl Discussions	7
FRG Bundestag Debate	8
More on FRG Debate	8
NEW TIMES Comment, by A. Tolpegin	9
French Interview With USSR's General Lebedev (Paris LE MATIN, 25 Nov 85).....	11
Dutch Paper Publishes Article by IZVESTIYA's Bovin (Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 26 Nov 85).....	13
Briefs	
TASS Cites Warnke's Criticism	15

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Soviet Comment on Results of Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Various sources, various dates).....	16
ZA RUBEZHOM Editorial	16
Army Paper Editorial	19

'Will Improve Climate', Editorial	21
LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Comment	23
Soviet Experts Comment	26
PRAVDA Editorial	29
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Editorial	31
Aliyev Cited	34
 USSR on U.S. Reaction to Results of Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Various sources, various dates).....	 36
Changes in U.S. View	36
'Right-Wingers' Concerned, by Boris Kalyagin	37
'World Has Become More Secure', by R.G. Bogdanov	38
U.S. 'Hawks' 'Agitated'	40
Reagan's Attitude Examined	43
Reagan Sees Summit as Starting Point	44
 USSR Cites Foreign Reaction to Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Moscow TASS, 26, 29 Nov 85; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 26 Nov 85).....	 45
FRG Debate	45
UK Reaction, Vladimir Posner Interview	45
NATO Socialist Parties Issue Communique	48
 EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
West Proposes Troop Withdrawals at MBFR Talks (David Adamson; London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, 5 Dec 85).....	50
 NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
TASS: U.S., New Zealand Clash Over Nuclear Policy (Moscow TASS, 28, 29 Nov 85).....	51
New Zealand Draft Bill	51
U.S. Reaction	51
TASS: Pacific Countries Oppose French Nuclear Tests (Moscow TASS International Service, 25 Nov 85).....	52
Moscow Notes Nordic Free-Zone Conference (Moscow International Service, 26 Nov 85; Moscow Television Service, 29 Nov 85).....	53
'Majority Support'	53
Conference Opens, by V. Kondratyev	54
Socialist Parties' Communique	55



## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### USSR HITS U.S. OFFICIALS ON SDI

#### Gen Abrahamson Cited

PM271611 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Nov 85 First Edition p 5

[A. Mozgovoy commentary: "Seven Steps to the Precipice"]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. summit had not yet finished when Lieutenant General J. Abrahamson of the U.S. Air Force -- leader of the "star wars" program -- made an appearance in the Belgian capital. What news had the transatlantic visitor brought to delight the West Europeans? The general stated at a Brussels press conference that, even if the USSR and United States reach an accord on the reciprocal reduction of strategic armaments, the implementation of the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) will continue at full speed. In the SDI "director's" words, research within the framework of the space militarization program is already ahead of schedule even now.

This is indeed the case. Recently, a laser installation and an electromagnetic gun were tested in the United States and during the tests the ability to hit missiles was checked out. The Pentagon has signed a contract with Lockheed for the development [razrabotka] of an ABM complex designed to destroy "flying objects outside the atmosphere." The U.S. military department has announced the decision to begin construction of an "aerospace craft" capable of "circling the globe in under 2 hours" and designed to put strike space systems into orbit. The U.S. Energy Secretary recently placed an order with the Handord National Laboratory to create [sozdaniye] a "compact nuclear reactor" to serve as the energy source for space weapons. Finally, it is planned in December to test a nuclear device in the Nevada desert similar to that with which the Pentagon intends to equip orbiting combat stations.

But even this does not seem enough. As Abrahamson himself told a LOS ANGELES TIMES correspondent, the "star wars" planners are thinking about a system with "seven or even more levels of defensive armaments" in space. Each level is a new type of strike weapon.

What joy for the owners of military monopolies, who see SDI as an inexhaustible source of superprofits!

What about the "defense" element then? Perhaps the "seven or even more levels" will make it possible to raise an impenetrable antimissile shield above the United States, as the "star wars" supporters constantly say. "On paper all the arithmetic is correct, but I doubt that this is how it will work out in practice," is the opinion of Hugh DeWitt, a physicist at the Livermore laboratory, who is conducting development work [razrabotka] within the SDI framework. John Pike, assistant director of the Federation of American Scientists -- and another major specialist -- notes with unconcealed irony: "Each individual level will be less reliable than initially claimed. Now they are talking about putting even more layers of tiles on the roof." But in the end that "roof" may collapse under its own weight!

General Abrahamson's "seven levels" are just seven steps to an unlimited arms race leading to the precipice of nuclear catastrophe. After all, unless the door leading to weapons in space is shut tight, the scale of military rivalry will increase immeasurably, new types of strategic offensive systems will appear, and accords limiting and reducing them will prove impossible. Those will be the consequences of SDI for whose accelerated implementation the U.S. general is campaigning.

Regan, Gen Rowney Cited

LD031721 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 3 Dec 85

[TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Bogachev: "Peaceful Space Is a Guarantee of Peace on Earth"]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Dec (TASS) -- The world public received with satisfaction reports that the two sides at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva again declared that their joint task is the prevention of the arms race in space and halting it on earth. As was stressed by foreign observers, the inclusion in the 20 November joint statement of the most important provision on the aims of the two great powers in the area of disarmament shows that the decisive factor in Soviet-U.S. relations remains the sphere of security, the core of which is the organically linked prevention of the militarization of space and the reduction of nuclear weapons on earth.

It is no secret that there are influential political forces active in the United States for whom the very prospect of preconditions for curbing the arms race is patently not to their liking. Certain quarters in the United States have lately been making desperate attempts to emasculate everything positive that was achieved during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. They see their main task as ensuring that the United States has a completely free hand in building up nuclear and space weaponry, thus guaranteeing superprofits for the U.S. military-industrial complex.

The prospects for preventing an arms race in space caused particular fury among the opponents of stabilization of the situation in the world.

A purposeful campaign is presently being waged in the United States with the aim of distorting the essence of the issue of the organic link between preventing the militarization of space and the reduction of nuclear arms on earth. Not a day passes without the U.S. press publishing articles in which the Soviet stand concerning "star wars" is misrepresented in every way and attempts are made to convince world opinion that at the summit meeting in Geneva the Soviet side all but agreed to the militarization of space by the United States.

Speaking in a CBS television program, White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan asserted that the Soviet Union had "reconciled itself" to the building of a wide-scale, space-based antimissile defense in the United States and that it was itself prepared to implement such a program. Regan attempted to refute the conclusion of specialists about the pointlessness of arms reductions on the relatively restricted area of the earth's surface if barriers against the deployment of strike weapons in the limitless expanses of space are removed at the same time. Meanwhile, he pretended that the deployment of a U.S. antimissile defense in space would not have a negative influence on the progress of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear arms.

In an interview for the ASSOCIATED PRESS agency, a highly-placed spokesman for the U.S. Administration, who did not want his name mentioned in the press, stated that the pledge of the United States not to permit the militarization of space, registered in the joint statement in Geneva, was just a tactical maneuver of no practical significance.

Standing the facts on their heads, General Edward Rowney, adviser to the U.S. President, told an AP correspondent that the USSR and the United States will only manage to seriously tackle the problem of a reduction in nuclear arms when the Soviet side stops linking such an agreement with a U.S. rejection of "star wars" plans.

The attempts by Washington's official representatives, just a few days after the signing of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement in Geneva, to make revision of the points fixed in it, give rise to amazement. Such statements are by no means evidence of a desire on the part of a number of figures in the United States to make a sober assessment of the situation that has formed in the world and are incompatible with a conscientious approach.

The Soviet leaders have repeatedly stressed that were a door to be opened into space for weapons, then the scale of military rivalry would increase immeasurably and the arms race would acquire an irreversible nature. The "star wars" program will not only stimulate the race in all kinds of weapons, it will also put an end to any restraint of that race.

If space is militarized, no sensible politician will be able to give a guarantee that it will be at all possible to organize any productive talks aimed at curbing the arms race on earth.

There can be no reduction of strategic nuclear weapons in the absence of a ban on space strike weapons.

The organic interdependence between peace on earth and a peaceful space is a reality of our time. To ignore it is, to an equal degree, senseless and irresponsible.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1176

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### TASS: U.S. CORPORATIONS REAPING PROFITS FROM ARMS RACE

LD021557 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 2 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes: Plans to develop and deploy space-strike arms are a brainchild of the American military-industrial complex.

This conclusion has been reached by the West German DER SPIEGEL magazine which has analyzed in a recent issue the role played by the U.S. military-industrial complex in the "star wars" project.

It was way back in the 1970's, the magazine recalled, that the California-based military-industrial giant Rockwell International issued a pamphlet touting outer space as the American frontier for growth, leadership and freedom.

Speaking of America's future, it suggested looking for a way to restore national grandeur in occupying outer space so that to deploy space stations armed with laser weapons by the year 2010.

The DER SPIEGEL article has served further evidence that it is the military-industrial business moguls that are the major promoters of militarism in the United States.

This fact is conceded even by the American press itself. The CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR said now that contracts for such huge military programs as the building of B-1 and Stealth aircraft had for the most part been awarded, the military-industrial companies had turned their eyes to the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] as the Pentagon's last vein of gold in the 20th century.

The SDI really is a vein of gold for the American military-industrial corporations. The estimated cost of building a system of stations consisting of 18 to 30 laser-equipped space platforms envisioned under the SDI program is between 100 and 500 billion dollars. And this does not include spending on research. It will cost from 27 to 38 billion dollars to orbit each platform and the maintenance costs of the projected space antimissile system will be not less than 10 to 15 billion dollars.

The program for creating a single-layer space defense, according to expert estimates, will need more than 500 billion dollars to implement, while a multitier space-based ABM system will cost the American taxpayer from 1.5 to 2 trillion dollars.

DER SPIEGEL said that Washington's plans to militarize outer space are to assure U.S. munitions concerns of major orders for at least the next 30 years. But a boom in these orders is not a matter of the far-off future: The space militarization program is already bringing arms manufacturers sky-high profits. According to the Federation of American Scientists, the military-industrial Boeing concern has already won 212 million dollars worth of SDI-related orders and the sum totals for the McDonnell Douglas are 199 million dollars, Lockheed 195 million dollars, TRW 186 million dollars and Hughes 98 million dollars. The American news bulletin INFORMATION said that even today the profits from "star wars" were boosting the military corporations' incomes by billions of dollars.

But those billions of dollars, it added, were only wetting their insatiable appetites and sending them scrambling to snatch a bigger share of the commercial orders coming under the trillion-dollar space militarization program.

A consultant of one of the major of the Pentagon's contractors put it fairly bluntly in THE WASHINGTON POST when he said that lower tension in the U.S.-Soviet relations was bad for the military budget. The arms merchants making millions of dollars in profits from building and selling tools of death and destruction are pulling out all the stops to whip up the arms race even further and prevent improvements in Soviet-American relations.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1176



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR NOTES VARYING OPINIONS ON W. EUROPEAN PARTICIPATION

French Defense Minister Cited

PM011750 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Dec 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "France Against"]

[Text] Paris, 30 Nov -- French Defense Minister P. Quiles has confirmed his country's negative attitude to the U.S. "star wars" project, describing it as "very dangerous." He told French television's channel one that the United States claims that this "space shield" will remove the nuclear danger, whereas it is my conviction that it will inevitably increase the risk of war breaking out.

The French must understand what "star wars" means, the minister went on. Two years ago the United States started talking about the "Strategic Defense Initiative," and next the term "star wars" appeared, but then they suddenly noticed that the word "wars" sounds bad, and now they say "space shield." It is a question of deploying a system of 400-500 artificial observer satellites and killer satellites equipped with laser weapons at a very great altitude above our heads. It is said that this will cost \$1 trillion. This "shield" would be to prevent nuclear charges reaching U.S. territory from the Soviet Union. But even if it were 90-percent effective, the United States would be totally destroyed just the same, P. Quiles pointed out.

Evolution of UK Policy

LD040819 Moscow TASS in English 0723 GMT 4 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 4 TASS -- "The results of the Soviet-American Geneva meeting were welcomed by the British public and politicians," PRAVDA's London correspondent Arkadiy Maslennikov says. "The next day after the Geneva meeting, BBC conducted a poll of TV viewers. The results were quite symptomatic: Three-fourths of the respondents said that the accords reached in Geneva made them more confident of the future. Also, most the respondents pointed out that both sides had benefited equally by the Geneva meeting, the Soviet negotiators had argued their viewpoint more efficiently and convincingly than their American counterparts. The evolution of British official policy on the plans to militarise space looks strange, to say the least, in the present-day situation," the journalist continues. "Only recent senior members of the Thatcher cabinet were publicly warning against the attempts to spread the arms race into near-earth space. This, they justly pointed out, could increase instability in international

19 December 1985

relations and enhance the threat of war. Lately, however, the same figures have been openly stating their intention officially to involve Britain in the so-called 'research' on the 'star wars' programme in the immediate future and, moreover, have voluntarily become pushers for the Pentagon, lobbying other NATO countries, primarily West Germany, to join in the programme. Neither do the British leaders find any convincing response to the invitation to join in the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions."

#### Thatcher, Kohl Discussions

LD281431 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 28 Nov 85

[Text] London, November 28 TASS -- Great Britain and West Germany are about to become direct participants in the sinister American "star wars" programme, conclude political news analysts after the London talks between British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

Both leaders reaffirmed their willingness to become involved in the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) at a press conference. According to them, final decisions on the form of this participation will be approved and sealed by relevant bilateral agreements with Washington as soon as December this year.

London and Bonn gave in to strong pressure of these overseas partner, and agreed on the extremely dangerous step which is the chief obstacle in the way of arms control. It must be noted that throughout the Conservative Party's rule, Britain backed the militarist, adventurous course of the American Administration. Margaret Thatcher ignored warnings by prominent British politicians who stressed that Britain's participation in SDI will inevitably sweep it into work on developing strike space weapons.

According to Denis Healey, a member of the Labour Party's "Shadow Cabinet", the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" threatens the world with an accelerated race of armaments -- both defensive and offensive. The development of new anti-missile systems, specifically the deployment of anti-satellite weapons, must be banned, he said.

Discussing East-West relations, Margaret Thatcher and Helmut Kohl positively assessed the results of the Geneva meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The British prime minister told the press conference that the meeting's results are of exceptional importance for Britain and West Germany.

The sides paid much attention at the talks to the present state of bilateral ties, and the situation in the Common Market, where, according to Kohl, there "remain differences" on financial and other problems.

# FRG Bundestag Debate

PM29124 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "Bundestag Debates"]

[Text] Bonn, 28 Nov -- The West German Bundestag has approved the defense ministry's draft budget. According to the budget, the FRG's direct military spending next year will amount to the record sum of DM49.9 billion. Thus one in four deutschmarks of state allocations next year will work for the arms race. Deputies from the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and the "Greens" Party have condemned official Bonn's policy aimed at cranking up military appropriations and also condemned its stance on the U.S. "star wars" plans.

In his speech, H.-J. Vogel, chairman of the SPD's parliamentary faction, sharply criticized the Federal Government's intentions to take part in implementing Washington's "star wars" plans, which threaten peace.

Stating his party's commitment to NATO and the Bundeswehr, H.-J. Vogel said at the same time: "We oppose any continuation of the arms race and are particularly opposed to its extension to space. After Geneva the Federal Republic's participation in the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' plans arouses even more doubts than it did before."

Federal Chancellor H. Kohl noted in his speech that the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States in Geneva was a "marked success."

## More on FRG Debate

LD030049 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, December 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy reports: The rightwing political circles and the military-industrial complex of the FRG not only intend to involve Bonn in the preparation of Reagan's "star wars" but are also striving to "supplement" the notorious SDI programme with their own "European version". The influential DER SPIEGEL magazine today came out with the revelation of these dangerous designs. With a reference to documents of the Bonn Military of Defence the magazine reports that a programme entitled "The European Defence Initiative" has been drawn up by the Defence Ministry.

This envisages the creation of a qualitatively new system of anti-missile defence, meant for hitting missiles and planes with the use of the latest military-technical equipment, including laser and electromagnetic weapons.

One of these days Defence Minister Manfred Woerner (CDU) [Christian Democratic Union] intends to submit the version drawn up in the FRG to the consideration of the opening autumn session of the NATO Council. The fact that the "European Defence Initiative" might seriously impede the just started dialogue between the USA and the USSR does not concern the Bonn minister who, just as his United States counterpart Caspar Weinberger, is banked exclusively on the policy "from the positions of strength", the magazine writes.



According to the information of DER SPIEGEL, such militaristic designs were conceived in Bonn late in 1982, that is, immediately after the rightwing conservative government of the CDU, CSU [Christian Social Union] and the Free Democratic Party came to power. The theoretical "substantiation" of these militaristic designs is the hackneyed propaganda thesis about the alleged "menace from the East".

The Bavarian aircraft concern "Messerschmitt Boelkow Blohm", (MBB) one of the main suppliers of armaments and military equipment to the Bundeswehr, gave assistance to the Bonn Defence Ministry in the drawing up of the programme. The MBB, Siemens and AEG-Telefunken concerns set the tone in the drawing up of this militaristic programme, the magazine writes. Jointly with the Dill military concern, the MBB has already created a model for a laser unit to hit targets in the air. The Bonn provided 25 million marks for the purpose. Alongside with Manfred Woerner, chief of the CSU, Bavarian Prime Minister Franz Josef Strauss inspires these militaristic designs.

The creation of the so-called "rail gun" is another trend of the designing that has been started. In the framework of the "European Defence Initiative" both weapon systems are planned to be ground-based, while their homing systems are to be air-based.

The relevations published by DER SPIEGEL show that Bonn, which talks about its adherence to a world with the lowest volume of arms, is actually working intensively for the creation of qualitatively new military programmes.

#### NEW TIMES Comment

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 42, Oct 85 p 8

[Article by A. Tolpegin: "SDI: Two Attitudes"]

[Text]

The attitude to U.S. President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative was recently debated at two seminars in Bonn. The first was convened by the Konrad Adenauer Fund, which is closely associated with the major governmental party, the Christian Democratic Union, the second by the executive of the opposition Social Democratic Party and a group of its members in the European Parliament.

The Social Democrats reject out of hand the militarization of outer space. The CDU/CSU however not only backs SDI and is pressing for an active West German contribution, but also demands that it be "supplemented" by a "European" defence system against intermediate-range missiles.

Last month a large group of West German industrialists and government officials went to the U.S. to learn the terms on which West German firms would contribute to American preparations for SDI. The group's leader, Horst Telschik, a foreign policy adviser, was the main rapporteur at the Adenauer Fund seminar. He announced that Washington was prepared to agree with

Bonn at government level to regulate the contribution of West German firms to SDI. He added that the West German government would decide on such agreement early next year at the latest.

The utterances of the Chancellor's adviser aroused indignation even amongst the leadership of the Free Democrats, who are "junior partners" in the government coalition. Though Telschik had presented his paper before reporting back to the government on his U.S. trip, he put forward his recommendations as if they had already received Bonn's approval. He could hardly have risked doing so without the Chancellor's support.

The Free Democrat leadership has never concealed its scepticism towards the SDI, rightly maintaining that it will torpedo chances of better East-West relations. The Free Democrats have intimated that talk about a Washington-Bonn compact is particularly inopportune before the Soviet-American summit which is to discuss the new Soviet bids for a reciprocal halving of strategic nuclear armaments. Indeed, everyone, including the Federal Chancellery, knows that ac-

cord will ensue only if Washington abandons designs to base strike weapons in space.

At the Social Democrat seminar Horst Ehmke, deputy chairman of the party's Bundestag faction, issued a statement in connection with the new Soviet proposals, emphasizing that the West German government would be guilty of irresponsibility were it, in the new situation, to agree to an industrial contribution to the SDI or give it political backing in any other form.

Invited to the Social Democrat seminar were leading physicists, lawyers, disarmament experts, and representatives of Socialist and Social Democratic parties from several West European countries. The consensus was that Western Europe would gain nothing but would, on the contrary, have much to lose from space-based weaponry.

So how should Western Europe respond to the U.S. plans? Right-wing members of the CDU/CSU are proposing a "European strategic initiative," implying an anti-missile shield for the continent. The seminar unanimously rejected such a "response," insofar as a "European

strategic initiative" would have the same adverse consequences as the SDI.

Though much, naturally, was said about the French-proposed Eureka project for West European scientific and technological cooperation, this has yet to be clearly defined. "Everyone is talking about Eureka. We are also talking about it. Everyone wants Eureka. We also want it. The only thing is that we don't know what it is," Gerd Walter, whom we have just quoted, leader of the Social Democrat faction in the European Parliament, fears that Eureka may be exploited as a "Trojan horse" by those who see Western Europe's self-assertion primarily in terms of the escalation of its military might.

Many speakers stressed that Western Europe's response should be political, not military. West European states should display initiatives to avert the militarization of outer space and reduce armaments on the ground, first of all in Europe. Though such initiatives would most likely incur the displeasure of those accustomed to regarding Europe as a "theatre" in a future war, they would definitely be in line with the interests of all Europeans.

/8309  
CS0: 5200/1176

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRENCH INTERVIEW WITH USSR'S GENERAL LEBEDEV

PM271301 Paris LE MATIN in French 25 Nov 85 p 12

[Unattributed interview with General Yuriy Lebedev, "member of the Soviet General Staff"—date and place not given]

[Text] LE MATIN: What do you think of the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]?

General Lebedev: SDI, announced by Washington on 23 March, has shown its real face. Why is the USSR opposed to this project, when the United States presents it as a defensive program heralding the end of ballistic missiles? Stocks of nuclear weapons are now vast. The implementation of SDI would spark off a reaction from the other side and the arms race would become irreversible. So we believe SDI threatens peace.

President Reagan has said he is prepared to transfer the technology to the USSR. This puzzles us. Mr Gorbachev reaffirmed the USSR's pledge not to be first to use nuclear weapons. In that case, why create additional defenses? It means that the President did not believe this solemn pledge. So how could we really believe this "promise"?

If each side worked to establish its own ABM defense system, it would also have a negative influence on strategic stability. Each side would try to modernize its defense to derive some advantage from it, while at the same time developing offensive weapons. The emergence of space weapons would lead to an extension of the arms race, control would become much more complicated.... and it would naturally be increasingly difficult to talk about an agreement on the reduction of nuclear forces on earth.

LE MATIN: To what extent can we now make progress on the limitation or banning of the SDI program following Geneva?

Gen Lebedev: During the Soviet-U.S. talks, the Soviet side raised the question of banning space strike weapons in the context of the agreement on the reduction of offensive strategic weapons. If that question is not settled, the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons in such a situation seems impossible, because we will instead have to strengthen our offensive potential so that the United States does not have the impression, having installed a nuclear shield, that it can now make a first nuclear strike against the Soviet Union with impunity. However, if the United States takes account of the other side's security interests, we can hope that space will remain peaceful and that we will find a way of solving nuclear arms reduction problems, making it possible to progress toward their total and general destruction.

LE MATIN: If the United States develops and puts SDI into practice, will the USSR do likewise?

Gen Lebedev: What means will we choose to guarantee our security? There are, of course, many solutions for doing this. It should be said that we will not necessarily follow the path toward which the Washington leaders are pushing us, consisting in the creation of a large-scale ABM defense system. We can also develop retaliatory offensive weapons which will penetrate the U.S. ABM defenses and develop means to counter its space ABM system.

LE MATIN: Did the Americans make proposals in Geneva which are acceptable to the Soviet side in the disarmament sphere?

Gen Lebedev: As far as the Geneva meeting is concerned, if we seek its positive aspect, it can undoubtedly be found in the joint statement in which the two sides recognize the impossibility of a victory in the event of nuclear war and pledge to make every effort in this direction and to refrain from actions which might lead to the outbreak of nuclear war.

The very fact that this question was raised and the agreement to which it gave rise lead us to hope that the United States will not set up its space ABM systems -- which will enable the two sides to work actively at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva and take them further. I would like to stress once again that the nonmilitarization of space is crucially important for this problem as a whole.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1176

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

DUTCH PAPER PUBLISHES ARTICLE BY IZVESTIYA'S BOVIN

PM291651 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 26 Nov 85 p 9

[Aleksandr Bovin article: "IZVESTIYA Commentator: 'The Soviet Union Wanted More'"]

[Text:] Speaking honestly, I expected more modest results from the meeting in Geneva. And this is one of those very rare occasions when I am pleased to admit a mistake.

I was convinced that Mikhail Gorbachev would do everything possible and even the impossible to bring the summit to a successful conclusion, but I was uneasy about Ronald Reagan's views. These views, which I have already been studying professionally for years did not, it seemed to me, leave any room for even minimal hope. And yet, there is now some hope.

The Soviet Union of course wanted more. We wanted concrete results on the problems of disarmament and -- what is more important -- we wanted to agree in Geneva that the arms race would not be transferred into space. But that turned out not to be possible. On this point the U.S. President was adamant. He listened to our arguments carefully, but did not accept our logic.

A strange situation has arisen. There are two packages of proposals up for discussion -- a Soviet and a U.S. package. Both provide for radical reductions in strategic arms. As for as the structure of the proposed reductions is concerned the Soviet and U.S. views are very different. Yet, there is still a real possibility -- given sufficient desire on both sides -- of bringing these stances closer together and finding a compromise acceptable to both sides.

However, reductions in existing weapons could be thwarted by weapons which do not exist yet. What is involved here is the U.S. President's "Strategic Defense Initiative" to create systems on earth and in space whose task it is to make nuclear arms "powerless and outdated." What we are busying ourselves with -- Reagan tried to convince his partner in the talks -- is defense and defense alone.

The United States threatens no one and would never do so. That, I repeat, is what the President said. He said so with passion. And I fully assume that the President meant what he said.

But the cruel hard facts speak a different language. The systems of strike weapons which would be deployed in space could take on two types of combat roles. First, they could perform a defensive role: shooting down attacking missiles. Second, they could also fulfill an offensive role: shooting down satellites in earth orbit and hitting

targets on land or sea. Thus, by realizing SDI the Americans would not only create a strategic defensive potential; they would also increase their strategic offensive potential. One should not lose sight of the fact that, parallel with this, the modernization of all components of the existing strategic triad is also going ahead at full speed. In other words, by making a strategic shield our U.S. friends are at the same time sharpening their strategic sword. In the language not of intentions, but of real possibilities this means the following: The Americans would acquire the capacity to deliver a strike and protect themselves from a retaliatory strike.

For thoroughly understandable reasons this worries Moscow. In the world in which we live and in which military strategic parity plays the crucial role, the Soviet Union will definitely be forced to seek and find an adequate response. We can find such a response. But, that is not our choice. The citizens of the Soviet Union do not want to waste any intellectual or material resources on a continuation of the arms race. And that is exactly what the Americans are proposing to us.

It is a very great pity that the two countries' leaders were unable to reach agreement on this most important, this crucial question. I would put it even more strongly: The time bomb under Soviet-U.S. relations has not been rendered harmless; the timer is continuing to tick away. And yet hope has appeared.

The whole character of the discussion in Geneva, where the President and the general secretary had the opportunity to get to know and understand each other better; the clear desire of both sides to demonstrate their readiness to improve the situation; the increasing awareness of the impossible, the unthinkable, and the catastrophic in a war involving missiles and nuclear arms; and the mood of public opinion in the world -- all these together allow us to think that "the spirit of Geneva" will bring about changes in what is done in Geneva.

The first step taken in Geneva and the steps which, I hope, are yet to be taken have a very direct connection with European affairs. An improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations would make a contribution to changing the strategic situation in Europe, to making it more stable and better suited to peaceful, normal life. The rebirth of detente will make the deployment of the new "Eurostrategic" missiles even more pointless. The West European U.S. allies would be performing a useful task if they could convince the Americans that they must look at the old problems through new eyes.

In short, there is a chance -- which can and must be seized. Then -- and certainly not before -- people will pass their final judgement on the significance of the recent meeting.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1176



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TASS CITES WARNKE'S CRITICISM--San Francisco, November 27 (TASS)--A prominent American authority on arms control issues has criticized Ronald Reagan's "Strategic Defence Initiative." Paul Warnke, former U.S. chief negotiator at the SALT talks, said in a speech at the California Commonwealth Club that the implementation of the "star wars" programme would make American and Soviet arms reductions impossible in principle, and would further aggravate the international situation. The question is either "star wars," or arms control, Warnke said. The Soviet-American summit, he stressed, opened good prospects for enhancing world security on the basis of the proposals for a 50 per cent cut in strategic systems. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0611 GMT 27 Nov 85] /8309

CSO: 5200/1176

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET COMMENT ON RESULTS OF REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

ZA RUBEZHOM Editorial

PM261505 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 48, 22-28 Nov 85 (Signed to Press 21 Nov 85) p 1

[Editorial: "Geneva--an Important Beginning"]

[Text] Geneva! Not only in Europe, at whose center this city is located, but on all continents its name has been repeated many times a day in recent weeks, and in particular during these days in press, radio, and television reports, in speeches by statesmen and politicians, and in ordinary people's conversations. Descriptions of the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders have almost totally squeezed out other events from the pages of U.S., West European, and many other newspapers and in radio and television broadcasts.

Large meetings and rallies, regional and national conferences, and international forums sent the participants in the Geneva meeting addresses, appeals, and calls containing insistent wishes, requests, and demands to reach agreement on what all the peoples were hoping for and expecting -- the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, the curbing of the arms race, and the improvement of the international climate. Numerous authoritative delegations, authorized by millions and millions of people seriously concerned at the danger of nuclear war, came to Geneva with similar demands. The urgent need to remove the danger posed to all mankind by a further increase in nuclear arms was also emphasized in messages from the UN secretary general and the leaders of the governments of India, Canada, and other countries. Even the governments of a number of U.S. allies, which usually obligingly support Washington's policy, found it necessary to openly voice their opinion that the first Soviet-U.S. summit meeting after a 6-year gap must end in definite progress and advances in this main direction.



## Main Direction

The chief purpose of the meeting was predetermined by the alarming situation which has taken shape in the world. The unrestrained nuclear arms race, whipped up by Washington over the past 5 years, posed a real threat to mankind's existence. The stockpiles of nuclear weapons are sufficient to destroy all living things on our planet many times over, to turn it into a dead desert for many centuries, and to cause irreparable harm to its atmosphere (the "nuclear winter"). The encirclement of the USSR and its allies with a ring of U.S. air and naval bases with nuclear weapons, the plans for a "limited" nuclear war in Europe, and the recent deployment in a number of West European countries of U.S. missiles capable of inflicting a first strike within 6-8 minutes have sharply increased international tension. This tension has increased still more with the start of extensive and multifaceted U.S. preparations for the militarization of space with the manifest aim of dominating it and achieving superiority over and imposing its will on the Soviet Union.

The Soviet leadership, firmly declaring and repeatedly confirming that it will not permit this, has also repeatedly voiced the desire to halt the nuclear arms race, to lighten the burden of military expenditure, which is complicating the already critical state of the world economy, to improve the international climate, and, above all, to normalize relations between the biggest and most powerful industrial and military powers -- the USSR and the United States. In order to prove its good will not just in words but also in deeds, the USSR unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, removed some of its SS-20 missiles from combat duty, and stopped all nuclear explosions, thereby halting all nuclear weapon tests.

Shortly before the Geneva meeting the Soviet Union suggested to the United States a 50 percent reduction in nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory, the abandonment of the militarization of space, and a limit on the number of warheads to 6,000 for each country, thereby ensuring identical security. At the same time the Soviet side proposes the abandonment of programs for the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of new strategic offensive arms, maximum limitation on the modernization of existing arms, a total ban on long-range cruise missiles, a halt to all work on the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike arms, and end to the testing and deployment of new kinds and types of nuclear arms, an end to the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and the establishment of a mutual moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

"We propose," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said, "very simple and clear things: to reduce by half the corresponding nuclear arms of the Soviet Union and the United States; to shut tight the door leading to the deployment of weapons in space; to halt and reverse the accumulation of nuclear missiles in Europe." This simple and clear program is entirely shared and supported not only by the Soviet people and their colleagues in the socialist countries, but also by all sober-minded politicians and public figures and by the working people of Europe, America, and other continents.

## Opposite Course

The U.S. ruling elite, at whose core is the military-industrial complex, not only resisted the curbing of the nuclear arms race, but also tangibly stepped it up when the present administration acceded to power. Washington secured from an obedient Congress the allocation of almost \$2 trillion for major new nuclear arms programs. Simultaneously, with the creation and deployment of a number of systems in the United States, the Pentagon accelerated the deployment in West European countries of first-strike nuclear missiles targeted on the USSR and its allies.

Washington rejected without serious examination or discussion all the Soviet proposals to end the nuclear arms race, hiding behind spurious talk of Soviet "superiority" and U.S. "backwardness." The specific Soviet steps in this sphere were irresponsibly branded as "propaganda" or were simply ignored. The United States responded to the Soviet moratorium on the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe by hastily deploying its own Pershing-2 missiles in the FRG and cruise missiles in Britain, Italy, and Belgium. As though scoffing at the expectations of the international public, the Pentagon, which is in the hands of direct henchmen of U.S. military-industrial monopolies, delivered new cruise missiles to Britain the day before the Geneva meeting started.

Direct interference by the U.S. military-industrial complex affected the stance taken by the U.S. side in Geneva. According to The NEW YORK TIMES, the proposal for an arms reduction "brought on an instantaneous spasm in the biggest arms producers," who saw this as a "threatened loss of tens of billions of dollars." Expressing their will, the defense secretary demanded that the President, in point of fact, wreck the necessary and proper discussion of the chief problem at the meeting -- the prevention of an arms race in space and its ending on earth.

The different approaches of the Soviet Union and the United States to the most important present-day problem, on which mankind's future depends, prevented the removal or even the lessening of the danger hanging over the world. The nuclear arms race will not be ended, and the U.S. desire to transfer the arms race to space continues to threaten the security of not only the Soviet people, but also all other peoples of our planet.

The meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders -- M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President R. Reagan -- together with the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted by them, with a number of important practical measures, and the other accords reached by them map out the general direction of the joint efforts which could be crowned with fruitful results and lead to an improvement both in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the situation in Europe and throughout the world.

At his press conference in Geneva M.S. Gorbachev exhaustively set forth the Soviet assessment of the situation in the modern world and the USSR's stance at the meeting, outlined the nature of the politically acute and direct talks, and, noting the positive significance of the meeting between the leaders of the two greatest powers, specially emphasized that through the joint efforts of the USSR, the United States, and other states it is possible and necessary to impart to the development of events in the world not a destructive, but a creative direction. This is what all peoples wait and hope for.

Army Paper Editorial

PM261201 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Nov 85 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Responsibility for the Future of the World"]

[Text] The development of the international situation is at a difficult stage. The objective course of world developments has itself placed questions of war and peace, questions of survival, at the center of world politics. In resolving these vitally important problems, the CPSU proceeds on the basis that the historical dispute between the two opposing social systems into which the modern world is divided can and must be resolved by peaceful means. Socialism demonstrates its advantages not by force of arms, but by force of example in all spheres of public life. As the draft new edition of the CPSU Program stresses, "the USSR does not encroach on any country's security -- in West or East. It does not threaten anyone, it does not seek confrontation with any state, it wants to live in peace with all countries. Since the time of Great October, the Soviet socialist state has borne aloft the banner of peace and friendship among peoples. The CPSU will continue to preserve its loyalty to this Leninist banner." The party adheres unswervingly to this principled line in foreign policy.

It was noted at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva was a major political event in international life. On the eve of the Geneva meeting, the Soviet Union did everything to lay the foundations for mutual understanding and improve the political atmosphere. The USSR unilaterally stopped all nuclear explosions, expressing readiness immediately to resume talks on a complete end to nuclear tests. The unilateral moratorium on antisatellite weapon tests was also confirmed, and radical proposals on reducing nuclear arsenals were submitted. The Soviet proposals to prevent the arms race from being transferred to space were accompanied by proposals on the development of the broadest international cooperation on the peaceful exploration and utilization of space for the benefit of all peoples. In the run-up to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, a session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee was held in Sofia. The whole planet heard the voice of the socialist countries speaking in defense of peace, the relaxation of tension, and cooperation; against the arms race; against confrontation; and for the improvement of the international situation in the interests of all peoples of the earth.

In the course of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the constructive Soviet stance, dictated by a sense of responsibility for the future of the world, was again confirmed. "We considered it necessary to try by force of argument, by force of example, by force of common sense to break the dangerous course of events," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted at the press conference for journalists covering the Soviet-U.S. meeting. "This was our conclusion: The time has come, under the threat of the universal nuclear danger, to learn the great art of living together. Both our Soviet people and, I am deeply convinced, the U.S. people are equally interested in this. All the peoples of the world have an interest in it."

Much work was done in Geneva. The major problems of USSR-U.S. relations and the present-day situation in the world were discussed. Great significance is attached to the fact that the Soviet-U.S. accord achieved in January 1985 on the need to seek ways of preventing an arms race in space and stopping the arms race on earth was confirmed. The joint statement contained in the concluding document of the Geneva meeting on the impermissibility of nuclear war and on the sides' renunciation of the attainment of military superiority is of fundamental importance. The great significance of the Geneva meeting also lies in the fact that it laid the foundations for dialogue with a view to achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations, and, indeed, in the world in general.

In the course of the Geneva meeting, both sides reaffirmed the intention to improve USSR-U.S. relations and promote the lessening of the threat of nuclear war, the prevention of the race for strike arms in space, and its ending on earth. True, this meeting could not find solutions to the most important questions connected with the task of ending the arms race and strengthening peace. Major differences continue to exist between the USSR and the United States on questions of principle. But the two states' leaders agreed that work to seek mutually acceptable solutions to these very important questions will be continued in Geneva by representatives of the USSR and the United States. There will also be a search for new forms of the development of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. And there will be further consultations on a number of regional problems. As Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stressed, the Soviet Union for its part "will make every effort, in cooperation with the United States, to seek the practical resolution of the tasks of curbing the arms race, reducing the stockpiled arsenals, and ensuring the conditions for lasting peace between our peoples, reliable peace on earth and in space."

The results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan generally create more favorable opportunities for improving the international situation and returning to detente. This was the assessment given by the top leaders of the Warsaw Pact states at their meeting in Prague on 21 November 1985.

They fully supported the constructive stance set forth by M.S. Gorbachev at the talks with R. Reagan in the spirit of the joint line expressed in the Warsaw Pact states' 23 October 1985 statement. At the Prague meeting the top leaders of the fraternal parties and countries assessed highly the extremely important contribution made by M.S. Gorbachev in the course of the Geneva meeting to the advancement of the socialist community countries' jointly elaborated peace-loving positions.

The principled course of the allied socialist states toward the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, the ending of the arms race on earth and the prevention of its spreading to space, the transition to real disarmament measures, and the strengthening of universal peace was again confirmed in Prague. The Warsaw Pact states stated once again that they do not seek military superiority, but will not permit superiority over them. Acting in coordination, the top leaders of the fraternal parties and countries declared their determination to continue to do everything in their power to achieve a change for the better in European and world affairs.

In the course of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the Soviet Union once again demonstrated to all the world's peoples its unshakable determination to seek lasting peace and international security and the establishment of businesslike, good-neighborly relations between states. This foreign policy course of the Communist Party and the Soviet state meets with the warm approval and unanimous support of all Soviet people. Soviet Armed Forces servicemen share the people's thoughts and feelings. In the present complex international situation, they see it as their duty to persistently master the combat hardware and weapons entrusted to them; to improve field, air, and sea training; and to strengthen organization and discipline.



'Will Improve Climate'

PM261653 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 26 Nov 85 p 1

[Editorial: "A Step Toward Peace"]

[Text] For the first time in the last 6 and 1/2 years a meeting was held in Geneva between the leaders of the two great powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States -- which bear the main responsibility for the fate of the world. It took place at the moment when mankind found itself on the edge of the nuclear abyss and had to stop, look around, think carefully, and decide what to do next. This is a most crucial moment in world history, when the questions of war and peace, and the questions of survival and control over disarmament are of paramount importance. It is precisely for this reason that many mass news media have called the meeting between M. S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan historic.

Even before the appearance of the Republicans in the White House, Soviet-U.S. relations were not distinguished by great warmth, and with the arrival of the present administration they deteriorated to the extreme. Our people and the entire socialist community have had threats and insults thrown at them from the other side of the ocean. The so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" has begun to be implemented at top speed in the United States, although no one has been able to clearly explain why this initiative ended up in the hands of the dealers in death. And, whereas in the "star wars" of the fantasists, whence those in the Pentagon have borrowed this term, a struggle is waged by the whole of mankind against an invading alien civilization, the Pentagon has begun to prepare a "star war" against the socialist countries.

That is why the world followed so closely the course of the 3-day meeting on the shore of Lake Geneva. The talks between the leaders of the two great countries were frank, protracted, and intense. They made it possible to more clearly understand the nature of existing differences, remove certain preconceived opinions in relation to the USSR, and clear away some accumulated prejudices.

Both leaders agreed on the necessity to improve Soviet-U.S. relations and to make the international situation as a whole healthier. They agreed to maintain a political dialogue so as to better understand one another and, on this basis, to seek mutually acceptable solutions to the vital problems of the day. With this aim it was deemed essential to meet again in the near future, no longer in neutral Geneva, but in the capitals of the two powers -- the USSR and the United States -- in turn. The dialogue between the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the U.S. secretary of state will be stepped up, as will the dialogue between the leaders of other ministries and departments.

Both leaders solemnly stated that they would not aspire to military superiority and they would not permit a war to be unleashed between the USSR and the United States, either nuclear or conventional, because any conflict between them may have catastrophic consequences. They advocated the swiftest progress particularly where there are points of contact, including appropriate application of the principle of a 50-percent reduction in the nuclear weapons of both states and the idea of an intermediate agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe.

All this creates opportunities for better mutual understanding and for advancing along the path of clearing away the obstructions of "cold war."

However, the Geneva meeting must not be either overestimated or underestimated. "We must be realists," M.S. Gorbachev stated, "and say directly: At this meeting we did not succeed in finding a solution to the most important issues connected with the task of halting the arms race and strengthening peace; major differences on fundamental issues still remain between us."

The existence of such differences is explained by the fact that the U.S. side continues to stubbornly insist on realizing its "Strategic Defense Initiative," which embodies the long-standing hegemonist plans of the most aggressive U.S. imperialist circles, primarily of the military-industrial complex. In the words of THE NEW YORK TIMES, the Soviet proposal to reduce weapons by half "caused an instantaneous spasm among the largest weapons producers," who regarded this as "a threatened loss of tens of billions of dollars."

Mankind has also not forgotten the cynical revelation of the "father of the hydrogen bomb," E. Teller: "The story that SDI is designed to help liquidate nuclear weapons on earth was thought up for domestic consumption within the United States, in order to strike a blow at the antiwar movement and to force it to reconcile itself to SDI." Now this story has been dragged out for external consumption, obviously counting on simpletons. But, totally unexpectedly for the U.S. Administration and the man in the street lulled by its rosy promises, scientists the world over, including its own scientists -- the Federation of American Scientists, Princeton University, and a number of other serious scientific centers -- have risen up sharply against this bluff. It is clear to everyone that whoever strives to carry the arms race into outer space is not interested in peace on earth.

The Soviet Union has countered the nuclear insanity of "star wars" with the constructive concept of "star peace," by proposing a complete ban on space-based strike weapons. In the nuclear age, security -- the central problem in relations between our countries at the contemporary stage -- more than ever before can only be general, collective security. In the face of the nuclear threat the USSR and the United States are faced with a dilemma: to survive or to perish together. There is no third alternative.

Preparing for the 27th CPSU Congress, Soviet people fully approve of the results of the Geneva summit negotiations. This is also the position of the working people throughout the entire socialist community, which was clearly demonstrated at the meeting of the top leaders of the Warsaw Pact states in Prague.

Geneva has begun a dialogue between the leaders of the two great powers. If the accords reached -- which are set out in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement -- are strictly observed by both sides, then this will inevitably lead to an improvement in the political atmosphere throughout the world.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Comment

PM261320 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 27 Nov 85 pp 1, 9

[Fedor Burlatskiy article: "The Responsibility of Political Leaders"]

[Text] The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan is the focus of the entire world public's attention. It is emphasized in the CPSU Central Committee Politburo resolution that the Geneva meeting was a most important political event in international life. It was the starting point on the road from confrontation to constructive dialogue between the USSR and the United States; between East and West as a whole.

Above all, great importance is attached to the very fact that the political leaders of the two great powers met after 6 and 1/2 years of acute confrontation between the United States and the USSR. What happened was not simply businesslike contact, but a truly frank and direct dialogue between leaders on whom so much depends in international relations. But matters were not confined to this. Contrary to skeptics' doubts, important results were achieved at the meeting.

The signing of the Soviet-U.S. joint statement was a major victory for political common sense. This document enshrines an accord on many fundamental questions concerning the prevention of nuclear and conventional war, common security, limitation of the arms race, prevention of an accidental outbreak of conflict, development of political dialogue at various levels, and fruitful cooperation in many spheres. A general agreement on USSR-U.S. exchanges and contacts in the spheres of science, education, and culture was signed. And despite the fact that it was not possible to find a solution at the meeting to the most important questions linked with ending the arms race, its results are evaluated everywhere as a major step toward a more stable and steady world and toward the shaping of civilized relations between states with different social systems.

An enormous role in the success in Geneva -- and this is also recognized everywhere -- was played by the Soviet leadership's constructive stance, both before and during the meeting. As M.S. Gorbachev stressed at his Geneva press conference, the very complexity of the international situation convinced us that a direct conversation with the U.S. President was necessary. "Our conclusion was as follows: A time has come when, beneath the threat of the universal nuclear danger, the great art of living together must be learned." This is why M.S. Gorbachev's one-on-one conversations with R. Reagan occupied such an important position at the Geneva talks. For over 5-6 hours the two leaders of the two great powers, face to face, discussed the points where the two countries' interests and positions either coincide or converge and the points where they diverge or oppose one another. This was the approach, the new diplomacy, and the political language that ensured productive talks.

The importance of this approach was also noted by President R. Reagan, who emphasized that "Mr Gorbachev and I turned our common responsibility to the benefit of the strengthening of peace."

Yes, Geneva demonstrated yet again that today, more than ever before, world politics needs leaders who responsibly and consistently seek to solve the main problem of all humanity -- the prevention of a universal nuclear catastrophe. In our age, a staggering and terrifying age when human knowledge has created weapons for man's self-destruction, the responsible state leaders of the two great powers have only one choice: To do everything to preserve universal peace. This is why the Soviet people and the international public ardently support the efforts of our country's leadership, which during the Geneva meeting consistently upheld precisely such an all-human approach to the solution of the problems of peace and to the question of terminating the arms race on earth and preventing it in space.

It used to be said in olden times that the first principle of political wisdom was the ability to free oneself from recklessness. Nuclear war is reckless, no matter from which side you look at it, from the West or from the East. The renunciation of it is the initial precondition for joint political actions.

M.S. Gorbachev stressed at his press conference that in present circumstances it is now a question of not only confrontation between the two social systems, but also a choice between survival and mutual destruction.

The starting point of the statement is a major gain for political common sense: Nuclear war must never be unleashed, there can be no victors in such a war. Recognizing that any conflict between the USSR and the United States could have catastrophic consequences, the sides also emphasized the importance of preventing any war between them, whether nuclear or conventional. They pledged not to seek to attain military superiority.

The United States and the USSR -- partners, rivals, or enemies? The White House leaders and the U.S. public are called upon to ponder this question once again for themselves. The joint recognition of the fact that a war between us is impossible logically demands a U.S. refusal to look upon the USSR as its enemy. Rivals as social systems -- yes; partners in the struggle against the common nuclear threat -- yes; but enemies -- no! Only such an approach makes it possible to switch the inevitable competition between the two great powers from military to peaceful tracks.

The ability to abandon in advance unattainable goals has also always been considered a sign of political common sense. It is not for nothing that politics is described as the art of the possible, as a sphere of combining different interests and of mutually acceptable compromises. As M.S. Gorbachev said, both sides must get used to strategic parity as the natural state of Soviet-U.S. relations and must make joint efforts to lower the level of this parity. In other words, to implement real measures to reduce arms on a reciprocal basis.

It can be said frankly, without going to either extreme in evaluating the Geneva meeting's results: What has been achieved was the maximum possible in today's difficult period in international relations. Only naive simpletons or demagogues can ask for more. The statement contains at least 15 points which pave the way for the restoration of mutual trust, the general improvement of the political atmosphere, and the fruitful discussion of economic and humanitarian problems and of problems concerning contacts and reciprocal information.



The ability to abandon the politically unattainable in good time is fundamentally important for evaluating the present stage of military competition. Neither side must do anything that could open the door to an arms race in new spheres, primarily in space. If it were not possible to prevent a space arms race, the scale of military rivalry would increase immeasurably and the race itself would become essentially irreversible.

The U.S. side at the Geneva talks was told this with total frankness. The Soviet Union is resolutely against transferring the arms race to space. At the same time, we have to consider the possibility that the Americans will continue along the old path. The international public was highly impressed by the warning given in this connection by the Soviet leadership. If the United States fails to appreciate our good will aimed at preventing the militarization of space, our response will be effective, less expensive, and can be implemented more quickly. This should prompt the U.S. ruling circles to reconsider the entire situation and to pursue a responsible policy based on common sense and taking into account the aspirations of all people on the globe.

But, as Voltaire said, minds are slow to improve.

We have sufficient patience to try, step by step, acting through the power of arguments, the power of example, and the power of common sense, to reverse the dangerous course of events.

One more thought comes to mind in connection with the analysis of the Geneva meeting's results. It is not enough just to conduct a successful political dialogue and to make important decisions. Enormous significance now will attach to the consistent implementation of the accords enshrined in the statement and to further progress along this path. Of course, it is to be expected that now, after the wave of a certain euphoria that swept throughout the world in connection with the Geneva meeting's results, the advocates of continuing confrontation in the United States and other countries in the West will gun their engines to full power. They will attempt with all their strength to belittle the significance of what has been achieved and will try to exact revenge in the mass news media, which generally and on the whole acted in a constructive spirit during the Geneva period. There will probably be some who will succumb to the temptation to interpret the results of the meeting in a primitive fashion, as a victory by one side at the other's expense. Under such circumstances, even greater significance will attach to a firm line of maintaining the constructive approach, a line of not allowing oneself to be dragged into a new round of "psychological warfare" and adhering in practice to the Geneva spirit of lofty responsibility, realism, consideration for one another's interests, and the art of living together and embarking on joint actions to improve Soviet-U.S. relations for the benefit of universal peace and security.

I would like to end my commentary with the well-known sentence by Heinrich Mann: "The scientific mind is a great renovator, a guarantee of the future, and a harbinger of healthy mankind." It is primarily on this that we build our hopes for development of the process of improving the international situation initiated at the Geneva meeting.

Soviet Experts Comment

LD261611 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 26 Nov 85

["Opinions of Soviet specialists about the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting" with remarks by Lev Semeyko, specialist on disarmament questions; Andrey Kokoshkin, deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists Against the Nuclear Threat; Doctor of Science Grigoriy Khozin; Retired Lieutenant General Mikhail Mikshteyn--passages within quotation marks recorded in Russian with superimposed translation]

[Text] The first speaker is Lev Semeyko:

The Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev noted after the meeting that this stage in the development of international relations is noted by a growing responsibility for the destinies of the world. The nations are aware of this responsibility. Such a situation should (?feed) the politics of states and the practical deeds of political leaders. The main problem today to be solved by all means is that of war and peace. Such is the Soviet stand. This is the top priority problem affecting the interests of all of us on earth. Neither the USSR nor the United States, says Lev Semeyko, can evade a search for the solution of the problem.

The Soviet Union during the summit showed that it decisively favors agreements to ensure equal security to itself and to the United States.

The Soviet leader noted that, on this basis, it would become possible to steadily promote mutual trust, to improve the political climate. The Soviet Union is convinced that lesser security for the United States than for the USSR would be of a disadvantage for the USSR because it would lead to mistrust and give rise to instability. The Soviet Union counts on a similar approach by the United States to what concerns this country.

Those were the views of Lev Semeyko, and now here is what Lieutenant General Milshteyn singles out from among the results of the Geneva summit:

[Milshteyn] "It is apparent that the time has not arrived yet to fully evaluate the importance and significance of the meeting of the leaders of the two biggest countries. Some time will be needed for a comprehensive appraisal. The summit is to have an impact along the main pivotal direction, curbing the arms race. I must note that the two sides (?reaffirmed) that the aim of their efforts would be a halt to the arms race on earth and its prevention in space. Both sides pledged to the world that a nuclear war must never be launched, that there can be no winners. Such a conflict of any scale could have only disastrous consequences. The two sides emphasize the impermissibility of any war between the USSR and the United States, nuclear, a limited war, or a conventional war. That was said at a moment when the Soviet Union has repeatedly proclaimed precisely this. The USSR has pledged, for example, not to use nuclear arms first, but it was stressed in the United States earlier that nuclear war is possible, if not a global war then on a limited scale, or a conventional war. It was said that it is possible to solve political problems with the help of force.

"Now, however, the contrary is being said at the top level, and this must have an effect not only on relations between the USSR and the United States, but also on relations between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries. On the whole there will be a beneficial effect on the entire international climate. This statement is of tremendous significance because it is apparent that it is impossible to rely on nuclear arms, that it is necessary to solve all issues peacefully, that it is necessary to reduce armaments. Both sides declared they would not seek military superiority. This is important because the state of military political parity that was achieved as a result of Soviet efforts has become the cornerstone of stability in strategic relations. Earlier the American Administration linked its policies with a desire for military superiority.

"I would also like to note that the two sides came to terms to study, at the level of experts, the issue of setting up centers for lessening the nuclear threat. All these measures are interconnected. All that is linked with raising the level of trust. The work of such centers would be geared to reducing the danger of an accidental conflict of an error in calculation or an error by a machine, by computers and so on. But extensive work and a lot of time are yet needed to set up such centers."

Those were views of Lt Gen Milshteyn. Another expert, Dr Andrey Kokoshin, says big differences remain between the two countries:

[Kokoshin] "Of course, we must bear in mind that there are substantive disagreements over a major issue as we see it. This is the attitude of the two sides to creating strike space weapons, a large-scale antimissile system. The Soviet stand was outlined in great detail once again. I and my colleagues have studied the issue and have discussed it with many Western scientists, politicians and even military leaders. All the possible aspects have been taken into account. I must note that a vast majority of eminent Western scientists, just as ourselves, feel it is wrong and dangerous to create space arms.

"We have carried out several special studies. Our conclusions are obvious. They confirm that such a program as the SDI, in any of its versions is a destabilizing program. Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that neither the USSR nor the United States should do anything that might open the doors to an arms race in new spheres or, to be specific, in outer space. If the doors were opened to weapons in space the scale of military rivalry would grow immeasurably and the arms race would become irreversible. It would get out of control. The SDI will put an end to any restraint in the arms race.

"The American side is unwilling to concede that the SDI amounts to putting weapons into space, but these weapons, both American and Soviet, will be flying over the heads of the people wave after wave. There were numerous arguments before the summit about what the Soviet Union would do if the United States does place strike weapons in space. At his press conference in Geneva, the Soviet leader gave a clear answer. He said the Soviet Union would naturally respond to the new threat. The answer will be found and it'll be effective, less expensive, and possibly accomplished in a shorter period of time. But the Soviet Union's political option does not lie in that. We want to engage in responsible politics."

Those were the views of Dr Kokoshin. All the Soviet experts agree that the most important issue at the summit was that of preventing an arms race. However, according to Dr Khozin, the talks have stimulated a solution of other major problems of our day and age. Dr Grigoriy Khozin:

[Khozin] "Mikhail Gorbachev has already noted that since the Soviet Union and the United States were allies in the war against fascism they can be allies in solving the global problems facing mankind. These include the potentials of the Soviet Union and the United States, especially the funds that could be released by a limitation of the arms race, that could drastically speed up their solution. We think not only of lifting the burden of the arms race from the Soviet Union and the United States, but also of chaneling the funds thus released into resolving pressing issues such as hunger, disease, ecology, energy, and raw materials. Take for example the problem of minerals and other raw materials. Here, there is a paradox. Some countries have more than others, but all countries already feel a shortage of some resources. This is what is happening already today.

"But the resources are not infinite. It is necessary to use them sparingly, in a thoroughly sensible way on a scientific basis. This is a problem no longer for one particular country, a country that has these resources. These are problems to be solved, to be solved by all the countries together. It is essential to decide how to open up access to new resources for mankind. The Soviet Union has said at the top level that it is ready to greatly step up the work, say, in thermonuclear fusion. It would like to have this problem tackled (?at) a wide international level. We have important results in this area. Work is also being done in Europe. Fine atom smashers exist in the United States. Together we can solve the energy problem for the whole world.

"Or take outer space. The Soviet Union notes the danger of its militarization, but the Soviet stand has another highly important aspect to it. This is the alternative to the "star wars". The Soviet Union is ready to return to broad cooperation in joint manned space flights. By joint efforts the Soviet Union and the United States can also solve the problem of exploring natural resources, for the developing countries also. In other words, the idea is to have a new thinking of principle in international relations, to have worldwide cooperation for the benefit of all. Today we have to deal with the issue of environmental protection. But many technical solutions have already been found, funds in joint work are needed. One of the most successful and intensively developing directions in Soviet-American cooperation in the seventies was ecology. Eleven groups of experts were at work. But we are not to blame for the fact that relations between our two countries worsened.

"Has the United States gained anything? Its ecological problems have not been solved. Has the United States benefited in any other way? No, it has raised even further the danger of destruction in a nuclear war. I would like to quote a phrase that philosophers are fond of. The earth, they say, is our common home. We have inherited it from our forefathers and are borrowing it from the coming generations. Realization of all of that is a major result of the summit, and we all should live and work together."



PRAVDA Editorial

PM021700 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "For the Sake of Peace"]

[Text] The contemporary period is typified by the activation in every possible way of the USSR's peace-loving policy over the broadest front of international relations. This policy is aimed at ending the arms race without delay; galvanizing the disarmament process; developing equal, correct, and civilized relations among states; and expanding and deepening mutually advantageous economic ties.

The Geneva summit between the leaders of the USSR and the United States occupies a prominent place in the Soviet Union's efforts to collaborate with a wide range of states for the benefit of peace. Our country went to the summit without the slightest illusions about U.S. policy, but well aware that the situation in the world is too dangerous to ignore even the slightest chance of rectifying it and moving toward a more stable and lasting peace. Even before the summit the Soviet Union did virtually everything to break the dangerous course of events by dint of example and argument and to make the political climate more favorable for the summit.

As a result, the Geneva summit was undoubtedly a significant event. In our present complex times the dialogue between the two leaders was in itself a stabilizing factor.

The main issue and the core of the Geneva talks was the question of war and peace and arms limitation. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted that a fundamentally important result of the summit was the fact that the leaders of the USSR and the United States stated in their joint document that nuclear war must not be unleashed. They stressed the importance of preventing any war -- nuclear or conventional -- between the USSR and the United States and pledged not to strive to achieve military superiority.

The USSR and the United States clearly reaffirmed their commitment to promote the growth in every possible way of the effectiveness of the regime for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and came out jointly in favor of the universal and total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. The accord to promote the speediest successful completion of the Stockholm conference also goes far beyond the bounds of Soviet-U.S. relations.

As a result of the summit, a number of useful accords have appeared in many avenues of the development of USSR-U.S. bilateral cooperation. They will serve as a good base to raise the level of trust between our countries and peoples. The security sphere and its nucleus -- the prevention of the militarization of space and nuclear arms reduction -- will continue to determine USSR-U.S. mutual relations.

Of course, the long-term significance of all the useful things agreed upon in Geneva can only be seen in specific practical matters. First and foremost, it will be necessary to focus efforts on unraveling [razvyazka] the most important questions which were not resolved at the summit, specifically the questions linked with the task of ending the arms race. The U.S. leadership's reluctance to abandon the "star wars" program prevented any specific accords being reached in Geneva on real disarmament and first and foremost, on the central problem of nuclear and space arms.

The Soviet side presented a set of profound arguments which must help the U.S. leadership find the will and determination to assess objectively the USSR's foreign policy positions and, primarily, to perceive all the pernicious aspects of the "star wars" program. This program is the main obstacle on the path to the radical reduction of nuclear arms.

The accord on the need to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth reached in January 1985 at the level of the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers and now confirmed by the leaders of the states, must remain the reference point in the quest for mutually acceptable solutions. The will expressed at the summit to accelerate this work at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms is of particular significance. The entire world will follow the progress in this work with intense attention.

New meetings of the USSR and U.S. leaders lie ahead. To avoid hindering the achievement of future accords, it is necessary to refrain from everything that would undermine what was achieved in Geneva, from actions which would block talks and erode limiters [ogranichiteli] of the arms race, like the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems and the relevant provisions of the SALT II treaty. The United States ought to heed the demand of the world community and, like the USSR, announce a moratorium on nuclear tests.

The main point in the approach to the new summit meeting is to create opportunities for really terminating the arms race and embarking on practical steps to reduce nuclear arsenals. Preparations must begin right now.

"...For its part," M.S. Gorbachev declared at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, "the Soviet Union intends not to slacken the pace and to aim for a curtailment of the arms race and a general improvement of the international situation with all determination and in a spirit of honest cooperation with the United States. We expect a similar approach to be displayed by the United States."

The USSR Supreme Soviet, having examined at its session the results of the summit meeting and the international situation, noted in a special resolution that the Soviet power's [derzhava] course of strengthening trust between all states and developing constructive cooperation, together with its commitment to seek solutions to even the most complex problems by political means and through talks -- a course which was vividly displayed in the activity of the USSR delegation at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva -- enjoys the ardent support of the Soviet people and the unanimous approval of the Soviet Union's friends and allies, encounters broad understanding among responsible statesmen and politicians, and is perceived with hope by the world's peoples.

And so, an important start has been made. It can become the fulcrum for a turnabout from senseless and dangerous confrontation to international detente. The Geneva meeting has enabled the peoples to gain a deeper understanding of responsibility for the fate of peace and of the need to act more energetically. They are justified in expecting practical deeds from responsible statesmen. Then the work done in Geneva will not have been in vain, the peoples' hopes for a more lasting peace will be justified, and good-neighborliness and peaceful cooperation will become the norms of international life.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Editorial

PM030930 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Dec 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Loyalty to the Course of Peace"]

[Text] Recent months have been characterized by a considerable activation of Soviet foreign policy. It is being implemented in various salients along the very broadest front of international relations, but its goals are nonetheless perfectly clear -- the strengthening of peace, the ending of the arms race, and the development of mutually advantageous relations among states. Convincing new confirmation of the Soviet Union's consistent and principled course was the Fourth USSR Supreme Soviet Session and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at it. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee revealed with the utmost clarity the essence of the present world situation and provided a realistic analysis of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva.

The work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and M.S. Gorbachev's report aroused widespread comment abroad. Prominent statesmen and public figures and the mass news media in various countries are noting that the Soviet Union intends to continue to struggle to improve the international climate, lessen the threat of nuclear war, and develop relations with other countries in a spirit of peaceful coexistence.

The need for urgent measures to fulfill these tasks was stressed at the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum. These guidelines were dictated by the time. As is well known, through the fault of the United States a sharp political "chill" had taken place on the planet, and mankind could at any moment find itself on the verge of world catastrophe.

Under such circumstances inaction or delay would be truly criminal. The Soviet Union deemed it necessary to take every possible measure to break the vicious circle of the arms race and to change the course of events for the better.

Such steps were taken, major, important steps that have produced weighty results.

In the past period, as M.S. Gorbachev's report notes, the ties among the socialist community states have deepened, both political and economic ties. The meetings of our states' leaders in Moscow, Warsaw, Sofia, and Prague were a milestone on the road of further rallying the fraternal countries.

Ties with the countries that have liberated themselves from colonial oppression and are members of the Nonaligned Movement are developing successfully on the whole. That is a very important factor operating in favor of peace, equality, and the freedom and independence of the peoples.

The USSR is making great efforts to improve ties with the capitalist countries; the recent Soviet-French meeting in Paris was an important stage.

But the prime responsibility for the fate of peace is borne by two states -- the USSR and the United States. So the tremendous attention paid by the international public to the Geneva summit meeting is not surprising.

The road to Geneva was long and difficult. From the beginning of the eighties the U.S. Government had been working toward confrontation, had consigned the many years of joint efforts to struggle against the threat of war to oblivion, and had adopted a course of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. To crown everything it began to hatch plans for taking weapons into space.

However, the Soviet Union countered this policy with its firm position. Our country put forward an entire series of large-scale peace initiatives that aroused ardent approval in various parts of the world.

The recent summit meeting produced significant results. "There is no argument," M.S. Gorbachev's report said, "the differences between us are huge. But in today's world the interconnection and interdependence between us are equally great. The acuteness of the present moment leaves the leaders and peoples of the USSR and the United States no alternative but to learn the great science of living together."

It is how to learn this great science that was the topic of discussion in Geneva.

The Soviet side pointed out with the utmost directness that space arms are by no means defensive, but represent part of a unified offensive complex; they do not lessen the threat of war, as the Washington propagandists claim, but, on the contrary, sharply increase it.

At the press conference in Geneva and in his report at the USSR Supreme Soviet Session Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made a positive assessment of the results of the summit talks on the whole. He noted the usefulness of direct, clear, and specific discussion and the opportunity to precisely compare positions, especially when this takes place at the level of top state leaders. A great many explosive and acute problems had accumulated and it was necessary to examine them seriously and try to get moving. The fact that this happened, that after an interval of 6 and 1/2 years a dialogue took place with the U.S. President, is certainly a stabilizing factor.

However, in Geneva it was not possible to resolve the most important questions connected with ending the arms race. The reason is the same old one -- Washington's reluctance to abandon the "space wars" plans. After the summit the stockpiles of weapons have not decreased and the arms race continues.

At the same time it would be wrong to belittle the significance of the accords reached in Geneva. Some of them are very important. For instance, the common understanding enshrined in the joint statement that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no winners in it, and the pledge by both sides to base their relations on this indisputable truth and not to seek military superiority.

The Soviet Union is convinced that this point [moment] must be made the basis of the two states' foreign policies not just in words, but in deeds. As the CPSU Central Committee Politburo emphasized recently, there are no contradictions that fatally condemn the USSR and the United States to confrontation, still less to war. Today the main thing is to create the opportunities for really ending the arms race and to embark on steps to reduce the accumulated nuclear arsenals.



Another factor that is of fundamental significance is the pledge reaffirmed by the USSR and the United States to help increase in every possible way the effectiveness of the regime of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. The sides agreed on joint practical steps in this direction, which certainly reduces the risk of nuclear war.

The accords reached in Geneva on holding another summit meeting and on prospects for bilateral cooperation in a number of spheres, and also the agreements on contacts and exchanges in the sphere of science, education, and culture arouse optimism.

Those who were in Geneva on the day of the signing of the joint statement and of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's press conference clearly sensed the atmosphere of elation and the joyful mood of the assembled people. The Soviet-U.S. accords and the results of the summit meeting have evoked a similar reaction throughout the world.

People's hope that a disastrous war will not erupt on the planet has certainly increased.

Is this hope justified? Is there a chance of really ending the arms race?

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev answered these question in the affirmative in his report. "Today," he said, "there is a real chance of sharply reducing the threat of nuclear war and then of totally eliminating the possibility of it. It would be a fatal mistake to miss this opportunity."

However, accord is achievable only if both sides' interests are taken into account. The United States' stubborn aspiration to continue the creation [sordaniye] of space weapons can only block progress; this would cause bitter disappointment on the part of all peoples, including the U.S. people.

Admittedly -- and the CPSU Central Committee general secretary drew attention to this in his report -- elements of realism were displayed in the U.S. side's position at the Geneva meeting, which helped resolve a number of questions. There is now a need for further progress. Among other things, it is necessary to refrain from actions which would undermine the things that the two countries' leaders agreed upon or erode existing limitations on the arms race.

The Soviet Union will do everything to implement the plans mapped out in Geneva. It is convinced that the achievement of lasting peace is realistic and feasible. This confidence derives from the support which the Soviet people, our friends and allies, and all people of goodwill are giving to the USSR's consistent and peace-loving course. The numerous letters being received in our newspaper's editorial office are imbued with pride in Soviet foreign policy and express full approval for the firm and principled position held by the CPSU in the international arena.

Aliyev Cited

PM031652 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS reports under the general heading "Congress of the Angolan People's Militant Vanguard"]

[Excerpts] Luanda, 3 Dec--CPSU delegation head G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who was warmly greeted by those present, today addressed the Second Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party Congress which is being held here.

"A world without war or weapons, a world of good-neighborliness and honest cooperation, a world of friendship among the peoples is socialism's ideal and our policy's objective," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has stressed. "We set ourselves the task of ending the arms race and press not in words but in actions for a most radical solution to the problem of nuclear weapons -- their complete prohibition and destruction."

This is precisely why the Soviet Union considers it essential to make use of any chance, any opportunity to set a limit on the arms race and halt the slide toward war. These were precisely the considerations which determined our approach to the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva and to the assessment of its results.

The Geneva meeting was a very major political event in international life. A fundamentally important result of the meeting was the fact that the USSR and U.S. leaders' joint statement said: Nuclear war must not be unleashed, it is important to avert any war between the USSR and the United States -- both nuclear and conventional -- and to not strive for military superiority.

The meeting again confirmed convincingly the correctness of the initiatives and actions recently implemented by the CPSU and the Soviet state aimed at resolving key questions of international security: The reduction of the war threat and a radical change for the better in interstate relations in the world arena.

In assessing the results of the Geneva meeting the Soviet Union, as the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution notes, proceeds from the premise that they are capable of exerting a positive influence on the improvement of the general climate of present-day international relations and lessening the probability of nuclear catastrophe.

Of course, a single meeting was not able to radically change the international situation and clear away the rockpiles [zavaly] built up over the years. We are realists and did not and do not expect such miracles. Furthermore the assurances given by the American side in Geneva must be backed up by real actions and U.S. policy. As for our party and the Soviet government, we intend to do everything to achieve the elimination of nuclear war on the basis of preventing an arms race in space and curtailing [svertyvaniye] it on earth. We are prepared to do and will do everything possible to see that fear of war disappears from the peoples' lives, the principles of justice and cooperation triumph, and lasting and immutable peace is established on earth.

In making efforts to curb the arms race the Soviet Union, and I would particularly like to stress this, is concerned not only for its own security and the security of its allies. We are convinced that in the present crucial period no people, large or small, and no country, developed or developing, can stand aside from the struggle for peace. Peace is mankind's common asset, and everybody must display concern for this common asset. For in a nuclear war not only will there be no victors or vanquished, there will simply be no observers — people counting on "sitting out" or "waiting out" a nuclear catastrophe, so to speak — left either.

The arms race is a heavy burden on the whole of mankind. Today around 800 billion dollars are spent on military purposes in the world every year. A truly astronomic sum! If this money was switched to the resolution of peaceful tasks it would be possible in the shortest space of time to put an end to famine, epidemics, illiteracy, and poverty and to accelerate the elimination of economic backwardness. You obviously know that the USSR has repeatedly proposed to the western countries that agreement be reached on reciprocally reducing military budgets so that part of the funds released can be channeled into aid to developing countries. Unfortunately, to date there has been no response to our appeal, but we are not withdrawing or retracting it.

Our new initiatives in the sphere of curbing the arms race go in the same direction, and if they received the requisite response from the United States this could promote the solution of problems which are today acutely confronting the enormous and diverse world of the developing countries. Our party and country advocate that people's efforts and energy and mankind's genius be directed not toward the creation of more and more new means of destruction but toward the objectives of prosperity and peaceful development.

/8309

CSO: 1175

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR ON U.S. REACTION TO RESULTS OF REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

#### Changes in U.S. View

PM261400 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 27 Nov 85 p 9

[Own correspondent Iona Andronov report under the rubric "Hello, New York!"; "Applause on Capital Hill"]

[Text] For 3 days running last week millions of television screens in the United States showed from morning until night the main event — the Geneva summit meeting. The final transmission was carried on Thursday evening: Having just returned to Washington, President Reagan delivered a speech at a ceremonial session of both houses of Congress on Capitol Hill. At the start of his speech the President said:

"It was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, that next year I will welcome General Secretary Gorbachev in the United States."

These words were greeted by applause. It was also obvious that Washington's senators and congressmen were not applauding simply out of politeness. Their applause reflected an accomplished historical fact: The 15 hours of talks in Geneva have led Soviet-U.S. relations out of the blind alley of dangerous confrontation of recent years.

Only by being in the United States today can one sense and fully appreciate the astonishing nature of Capitol Hill's ovation at the Soviet leader's forthcoming arrival here.

After all, television screens here still show, literally every week, caricatured pseudo-Soviet villains who treacherously invade U.S. soil, plunder, torture, and execute. Posters can still be seen all over New York advertising the new anti-Soviet hit movie "Rocky IV" with the slogan "be ready for the coming world war!" Ignorant people are still being stupefied by the propaganda of hatred and are being sold T-shirts carrying the slogan "kill a commie for mommy!" Only a few weeks ago, 76 percent of the people polled here could not name the top leader of the Soviet Union....

And now he is being applauded! As former Senator George McGovern put it, henceforth Americans can rid themselves of the nightmarish expectation of a nuclear missile war tomorrow.

After Reagan's speech on Capitol Hill, House of Representatives Speaker Thomas O'Neill announced:

"We believe the discussions in Geneva have begun the important process of reducing tensions between the United States and the USSR. We are encouraged by the fact that the Geneva joint statement affirmed the principle of significant reduction of nuclear arsenals. We applaud the joint pledge to seek agreements banning chemical weapons."

Senator Kennedy added: "This is a step forward." Senator Dole: "This is a promising start of dialogue and talks." Senator Quayle: "This is an important measure against strife between the greatest powers." Former U.S. Secretary of Defense Schlesinger: "This is a return to detente."

But the fiercest enemies of detente have not fallen silent yet. The Pentagon chiefs, leaders of Washington's "hawks" Howard Phillips and Richard Viguerie, and extreme right-wing newspaper observers George Will and Robert Novak are publicly calling on the President, during his next meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, not to agree under any circumstances to freeze the "star wars" program or observe the Soviet-U.S. ABM and SALT II treaties. THE WASHINGTON POST recalled on 22 November how, on the eve of the Geneva meeting, the main initiators of the "star wars" project called at the White House and tried, in their own words, "to bury the Geneva meeting..."

It was not to be. Geneva has irreversibly changed a very great deal in the minds of Americans.

#### 'Right-Wingers' Concerned

LD301948 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 30 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; talk by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. More than a week has passed since the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva but the name of that Swiss town continues as before to be present on the pages of the world press. The conversations between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States are being appraised as a major political event in international life of the eighties. When I was in Geneva at the time of the meeting I witnessed for myself the unprecedented interest in the meeting by the world public and the mass information media.

The positive response to Geneva has been so great that, it seems, it has caused confusion in ultra right-wing circles in America. They are displeased by the outcome of the Geneva dialogue and particularly by the agreement on holding further summit meetings. They are fearful, as Republican Senator Wallop has put it, that in the process of preparing for these meetings steps will be taken to improve the climate of Soviet-U.S. relations and that in consequence, attacks on the Soviet Union will become less strong.

However, the thing disturbing the U.S. right-wingers is instilling the majority of politicians, including in the United States itself, with good hopes. A characteristic item is the five former U.S. secretaries of state, including Democratic and Republican ones, who have called the results of Geneva successful.



The declaration in Geneva that nuclear war must never be unleashed, that there can never be a winner in a nuclear war and that both sides undertake not to strive for military superiority has been greeted with great satisfaction. The affirmation of these principles is capable of having a positive effect on altering the political and psychological atmosphere in current international affairs.

It is said that much is to be perceived from comparisons and this is especially true with regard to politics. The head of the U.S. Administration, who even recently was claiming that, as he put it, the Russians are not to be trusted, has now, as THE WASHINGTON POST has stressed, voiced optimism about future Soviet-U.S. talks. Geneva has inflicted a blow on the ideology and policy of crusades against socialism.

One needs of course to view things realistically. Success was not achieved in reaching agreement on the main issue of nuclear and space armaments. The U.S. Administration proved unprepared for that. The causes giving rise to the armaments race still exist. One must not forget either that the Washington hawks intend to get their revenge for Geneva and to go over to a counteroffensive and give such a momentum to the "star wars" program that it would be difficult to halt it. Efforts in the struggle to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, therefore, must not lessen. As the CPSU Central Committee Politburo pointed out, the sphere of security, the nucleus of which is the problem of averting the militarization of space and reducing nuclear armaments in an organically interrelated way remains the determining factor in Soviet-U.S. relations.

The long-term significance of the Geneva meeting will be revealed in specific practical deeds. It depends on the readiness of both sides to act on the basis of the joint statement adopted in Geneva. The Soviet Union is striving to do everything necessary for this. We are expecting such an approach from the United States.

#### 'World Has Become More Secure'

PM301931 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Commentary by R.G. Bogdanov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute, under the rubric "Interview at the Teleprinter": "Those Who Do Not Like Reciprocal Contacts"--first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The editorial office has just received this TASS report from Washington over the teleprinter:

Lieutenant General J. Abrahamson, director of the organization for the implementation of the "star wars" program, has held a briefing for journalists at the Pentagon. The subject of his remarks was the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). The general lamented that the appropriations of billions of dollars released by Congress for the implementation of SDI are grossly inadequate and demanded that Congress allocate additional appropriations.

We asked Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute, to comment on this report.

[Bogdanov] Today the attention of the majority of analysts of U.S. domestic and foreign policy in all countries is keenly focused on reports from Washington or New York. That is no accident. At present, the question of what influence the Geneva meeting between the two powers' leaders will have on the distribution of forces within the U.S. ruling circles is being discussed animatedly in the United States. How will what was achieved in Geneva affect the future development of Soviet-U.S. relations?

It must be said that in the last few days a number of interesting items have appeared in the U.S. press analyzing the situation and, in my view, expressing the most important thing -- a certain process of demarcation of U.S. political forces in connection with the summit meeting. On the one hand, there is an intensive mobilization under way of all the right-wing or, more accurately, ultraconservative circles, for whom the Geneva dialogue was an extremely dangerous event which jeopardized not only their strategic plans, but also the further development of the arms race and therefore, their profits. Geneva frightened these circles and rallied them around the idea of wrecking everything that was achieved during the summit meeting.

These circles, through their very prestigious representatives, among whom Lt Gen Abrahamson holds a special place, have made it clear that their main task is to prevent the emergence of a situation in which a reduction in military spending and the curtailment of the "star wars" program would begin.

On the other hand, Geneva gave impetus to another process -- the activation of all the realistically minded forces in the U. S. ruling class who have long since realized that Soviet-U. S. confrontation is an impasse and the course of creating [sozdaniye] space strike weapons and placing them in space is fraught with the danger of nuclear catastrophe. These forces are represented in Congress, in the Senate, and in some of the U. S. mass media. That has to be encouraging.

I think the mood of realistically minded Americans was expressed very well by Congresswoman Barbara Boxer from California: "My fellow citizens and I feel better today. In our district we have devoted much effort to passing a resolution on the nuclear arms freeze in California. At least now we know the restoration of contacts between our two countries has begun."

Unfortunately, as has happened repeatedly in the United States, once again the right wing is louder, more loquacious, and more brazen than realistically-minded politicians. The conservatives are trying to influence public opinion with fine rhetoric and pseudoarguments and thus, to exert pressure on the U. S. Administration and the political decisionmaking process.

In these conditions an entirely reasonable question arises among analysts and observers in the United States and elsewhere: How will events develop in the future? Who will prevail in America today? You know, at this stage I would nevertheless refrain from drawing final conclusions. But I must say: There are grounds for optimism. There are also grounds for faith in the U. S. people's common sense, faith that this common sense will eventually prevail and lead to the isolation of ultraconservative circles.

In conclusion, I wish to say that Geneva has considerably strengthened the positions of realistically-minded politicians within the United States. The world has become more secure. We can all breathe more easily. I think that is the main result of the meeting.

U.S. 'Hawks' 'Agitated'

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Dec 85 First Edition p 3

[Col M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Geneva: Who Is Against?"]

[Text] The more time that elapses since the meeting between Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva, the more definite and precise is the assessment of it on the part of the world public. Following the first responses, there is an increasingly detailed and profound analysis of its results and consequences for Soviet-U.S. relations and the whole of international development. And it is perfectly obvious that throughout the world the results of the meeting are seen as positive on the whole.

Such an appraisal is of course no accident. The Geneva meeting was in fact a major political event in international life. The peoples regard as a fundamentally important result of it the fact that the USSR and U.S. leaders stated in the joint document that nuclear war must not be unleashed. What is more, they stressed the importance of averting any war between the Soviet Union and the United States, either nuclear or conventional, and pledged not to strive to secure military superiority. It is clear to every sensible person that in this sense the results of the Geneva talks are capable of exerting a positive influence on a change in the political and psychological climate in contemporary international relations, of improving them, and reducing the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war.

A fundamental appraisal of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva in the context of the contemporary international situation, taking account of the experience of the past, prospects for the future, and the specific tasks in the foreign policy sphere which the Soviet Union has yet to tackle, was made at a CPSU Central Committee Politburo session and at the 4th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation. M.S. Gorbachev's report at the session showed convincingly that the Geneva dialogue -- and the path toward it, as is known, was long and difficult -- proved necessary and useful.

The overall balance of this dialogue was undoubtedly positive.

The significance of the accords reached in Geneva must not be minimized. At the same time, the session of the USSR's supreme organ of state power noted that no solutions had been found at the meeting to the most important questions connected with halting the arms race. "The U.S. leadership's reluctance," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his report at the session, "to abandon its 'star wars' program did not enable us to reach specific accords in Geneva on real disarmament and primarily on the central problem of nuclear and space weapons. The number of weapons stockpiled by both sides has not diminished as a result of the meeting and the arms race continues. This cannot fail to cause disappointment.

But even this, to a certain degree limited, result of the Geneva meeting aroused considerable alarm in the camp of reaction, primarily among those who represent the forces of militarism and aggression in the United States. They continue to maintain that an atmosphere of enmity and tension in relations between the United States and the USSR is, supposedly, "the natural state" for two states belonging to opposing socioeconomic systems. This being so, Soviet-U.S. talks only make sense as a cover and even a justification for the arms race. Otherwise, they are not only not necessary, but even downright harmful and dangerous to the United States. A certain (G.) Phillips, a representative of the Washington "hawks", is ringing the bell when he says that the Geneva meeting "creates an atmosphere which may make an arms buildup more difficult."

Supporters of the implementation of the "star wars" program are particularly assiduous in this direction. What false arguments do they not resort to in order to try to substantiate the "legitimacy" and "need" to militarize space and create space strike weapons. In particular, it is alleged in defiance of elementary logic that the means envisaged by the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) are not even weapons at all, or, if they are, they are targeting not against people, but exclusively against missiles. The question immediately arises here: Is it not simpler and better to radically reduce the number of such missiles and other nuclear means capable of reaching each other's territory, as the Soviet Union proposes, than to transfer the arms race to space, create space strike means, and thereby undermine the very possibility of achieving agreements on radical reductions in nuclear weapons, and in the longer term, on their total elimination by all nuclear states.

So why are the "star wars" apologists becoming so agitated? First, because the temptation to somehow acquire military superiority has not left them. And they are encouraged by the fact that this temptation is also felt within the Washington administration itself. Second, those U.S. corporations which are already or still intend to become Pentagon contractors for the manufacture of space strike weapons are counting on multi-billion, truly cosmic profits. After all, this year the U.S. Congress approved the allocation of \$2.7 billion for work connected with creating [sozdaniye] an antimissile defense, and next year the organization for the implementation of SDI -- headed by General Abrahamson -- intends to request \$4.9 billion.

It would be possible to say a great deal about the directions in which work on the "star wars" program is being carried out. The same Gen Abrahamson recently reported that the decision had been made to accelerate the creation of [sozdaniye] space weapons which function on the basis of nuclear explosions. We are talking about lasers which transform the X-ray radiation emitted in a nuclear explosion. Work on space-based lasers and electromagnetic guns is continuing. Let us note, incidentally, that an experimental model of the "Excalibur" X-ray laser has already been tested four times at the nuclear test site in Nevada.

However, it is not just a question of these facts, however dangerous they may be in themselves. It is becoming perfectly obvious that the forces of the military-industrial complex and U.S. political reaction are striving to emasculate the meaning of the Geneva accords, hinder the curbing of the arms race, and continue the course of confrontation with the USSR. The actions of representatives of the U.S. military-industrial monopolies, the militarist elite, and their henchmen in key positions in the state apparatus go so far that the U.S. press itself is starting to write about them openly. Within the last few days alarming articles on this score have already appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST and in a number of other mass news organs. They specifically name these corporations -- the Pentagon's leading contractors such as Northrop, General Dynamics, Martin-Marietta, Lockheed, Boeing, Rockwell International, and others -- and describe how they are making a fortune from the arms race and what they fear from the implementation of the peace initiatives which the Soviet Union is promoting in the international arena.

These and other U.S. military-industrial monopolies have highly influential representatives even within the Washington administration itself and in the U.S. Congress. Among them it is impossible not to single out the figure of U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger. A week ago, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA already described in some detail his notorious letter to the President on the eve of the Geneva meeting. It was said at that time that the publication of this letter was none other than a direct attempt to sabotage the Soviet-U.S. meeting. Now, observers are increasingly beginning to think about whether this letter was an attempt to discredit the U.S. President himself and undermine his positions on the eve of very crucial talks with the Soviet leadership.



It is also impossible not to mention the ideological headquarters of U.S. ultra-right-wing circles which support a continued arms race and confrontation with the USSR -- such as the Heritage Foundation. Delivering his report at the recent session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, M.S. Gorbachev pointed out that the unique "order" issued by that organization to the U.S. President on the eve of his departure for Geneva had not escaped the attention of the Soviet leadership. The President was directly instructed to continue the arms race, not to give the Soviet Union the opportunity to switch funds to the implementation of socioeconomic programs, and ultimately, to seek to squeeze the USSR out of international politics and even force our country to change its system and its Constitution.

The Heritage Foundation continues to be active. Its representatives noisily declare that "all agreements are mere pieces of paper;" they welcome SDI because it "stimulates the arms race" and is designed to "defeat Soviet strategy;" and they grieve that the United States "has insufficient might in terms of nuclear warheads."

All this once again underlines the correctness of the appraisal given at the USSR Supreme Soviet session that militarism is hostile to the peoples and that the arms race whipped up by the military-industrial complex thirst for gain strikes against the vital interests of all countries.

The Soviet Union and its allies and friends proceed from the fact that reason must triumph. The nuclear threat must be eliminated from the life of society and the development of international relations must proceed in the spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente.

In the face of the military threat and strong-arm pressure, the USSR will not waive its security interests and will not permit military superiority to be achieved over it. The repeated attempts of the imperialist forces in this direction suffered failure in the past. And they are doomed to failure even more so now that our country has modern armed forces and a huge scientific and technical potential at its disposal.

There is no doubt that, despite the complexity of the contemporary international situation, the Soviet people's peaceful labor will be ensured. The Soviet Armed Forces are in a state of constant readiness to defend peace and reliably ensure the security of their motherland and our friends.



### Reagan's Attitude Examined

LD011759 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Dec 85

[From "The International Panorama" program presented by Stanislaw Kondrashov]

[Excerpts] In the avalanche of reaction provoked throughout the world by the Soviet-U.S. summit, there are practically no negative reactions to be found. Statesmen, be it in Europe or the United States, Asia or, say, Australia, and ordinary people everywhere, are in favor of it. They approve the talks which took place; they approve the commitment to continue the dialogue; they approve the process of increasing contacts between the two sides at various levels. All this attention, interest, and approval once more convincingly proves that not only in our two countries, but far beyond them, too, the importance of normal Soviet-U.S. relations for the state of affairs throughout the world is understood.

The explanation for this is simple. The consequences of the use of nuclear weapons know no national frontiers. Even the sceptics have accepted Geneva. Even the ill-wishers now do not dare raise their voice against it. But of course, there exist different appraisals of the future and the near-and long-term prospects. I would like to dwell in more detail on reaction within the United States, relying to the maximum on the evidence of the U.S. press and of course, statements by officials.

We must also let President Reagan have his say. He and his aides who accompanied him to Geneva are now saying a lot about the outcome of the meetings. Here, for instance, are the President's words: "We had a genuine dialogue. Nothing was concealed and no one tried to pretend that we had achieved more than we really had in those fields where we simply could not get closer to one another.

We relaxed the atmosphere. I think we felt that there were points of contact. Deeds will be needed to remove suspicion and mistrust on both sides."

In another speech he made, a radio message to Americans on 23 November, the President said, among other things: "I am planning to meet Mr Gorbachev again next year in Washington, but in the meantime there is much work to do. It is not worth wasting opportunities to work on important problems of Soviet-U.S. relations."

All this, overall, sounds sober and good. But at the same time, it is necessary, in the interest of accuracy, to stress quite definitely, that in his post-Geneva statements the U.S. President is still glorifying the policy of strength, declaring that it justifies itself. He is still speaking of complete adherence to his Strategic Defense Initiative. He calls implementation of his program for modernization of the strategic forces an incentive for the holding of talks on their reduction -- the reduction of these forces.

The majority of Americans are more inclined toward reasonable compromise than is the White House. This is noted also by observer David Broder. This is what he writes regarding this: Conversations with Americans confirm the results of a public opinion poll conducted before the summit and showing that Americans are ready to agree to a compromise, which Reagan does not want -- namely, the renounce the "star wars" program in exchange for a radical reduction of offensive weapons.

Incidentally, a month ago, when we four Soviet journalists interviewed the President in his office we asked him this question twice: "Does the President intend to take into account this opinion of the Americans, who prefer a radical reduction of existing nuclear weapons to the creation of some kind of space defense?" Both times the President evaded a direct reply, showing that he would not move toward complying with the wish of the majority of his compatriots and still preferred his Strategic Defense Initiative.

#### Reagan Sees Summit as Starting Point

LD031408 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 3 Dec 85

[Text] Speaking on Monday, in Seattle, Washington, President Ronald Reagan declared that this meeting with Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, in Geneva has served as a new starting point in relations between the two nations. Progress at the talks in Geneva, he claimed, became possible because in the past 5 years he has sought to make America stronger.

Reagan reaffirmed his administration's intention to go on with the work connected with (?the) Strategic Defense Initiative. It is common knowledge that this program is aimed at militarizing outer space and at gaining the opportunity to deal the first nuclear strike hiding behind a space shield. Characteristically, outside the hotel the President was speaking in, a demonstration was staged against the aggressive militaristic policy pursued by his administration.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1175

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR CITES FOREIGN REACTION TO REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

#### FRG Debate

LD262019 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT 26 Nov 85

[Text] Bonn, November 26 TASS -- Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the parliamentary group of the opposition Social Democratic Party, has criticised Bonn's foreign-policy course which, as he put it, has led to a "sharp decline in the prestige of the FRG in the international arena". Speaking in the Bundestag today, he pointed out that the idea of ensuring international security through East-West cooperation, the idea which is being supported by the Social Democrats and is being rejected by the ruling CDU-CSU coalition, "has taken concrete outlines at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva". This, he said, also applies to the thesis that nuclear war cannot be won and that none of the sides should seek military superiority.

"We," Hans-Jochen Vogel stressed, "are against any continuation of the arms race, particularly against its proliferation to outer space. The FRG's participation in the U.S. 'Strategic Defence Initiative' appears still more undesirable after the Geneva summit. Further stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction reduces security rather than increases it".

Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the FRG, who spoke in the debate, stated that the positive results of the Geneva meeting "became possible only because the two sides promoted that". "The Government of the FRG", he said, "gives due credit to the constructive stand of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev". At the same time Helmut Kohl, contrary to any logic, asserted that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue was ostensibly "promoted" by Bonn's implementation of NATO's decision on nuclear-missile "rearmament" of the FRG as well as by measures to "strengthen the Bundeswehr and the Western alliance".

#### UK Reaction

LD270715 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 26 Nov 85

[Interview with Moscow Radio correspondent Vladimir Posner by correspondent Nikolay Gorshkov following Posner's 8-day visit to the United Kingdom; date and place not given--live or recorded]

[Text] [Gorshkov] You had a rare opportunity, Vladimir, to watch from the inside, so to say, the British coverage of the Soviet-American summit in Geneva. How would you describe the general spirit of the coverage and the reactions to the outcome of the summit?

[Posner] Well, initially, the coverage was quite negative, actually, before the summit began. There were many predictions that the summit would be a complete disaster; that nothing would be achieved, that the Soviets were not budging on their part of it, and that Reagan would not budge on his part of it. The general outlook, I would say, was rather dark and somber. However, during the actual summit, there was a change in heart because of the fact that when the two leaders met, instead of 15 minutes at this initial get-to-know-each-other meeting, they talked for 64 minutes, as the press indicated, and they seemed to be getting along very well, so immediately the tone changed to one of almost euphoria that this was going to be something totally magnificent. Finally, when the summit was over after the 2 days of total news blackout when the press were not allowed to have any information, the reaction was, I would say, by and large quite positive, and that was that the spirit of Geneva was a very good one, that indeed a fresh start had been taken and that the world had become a safer place to live in.

[Gorshkov] Well, the overwhelming feeling in the world after the summit seems to be that of relief and hope: relief that the worst period in the East-West relations has passed and hope that a more stable and peaceful future is in sight. The Soviet Union, for its part, has offered much to put these hopes into practice. But is the Soviet position getting a fair account in the Western media?

[Posner] In all honesty, I would have to say that I don't believe it is. I spent 8 days in the UK reading the press, watching television very carefully, and also picking up a lot of American magazines and newspapers, and I would have to say that your average reader in the West, be it in the UK or the United States, would have to make a special effort to really understand what the Soviet position is. They know that the Soviets are against SDI and they probably know that the Soviets have proposed a 50 percent reduction in nuclear warheads but they certainly don't know that the Soviets had unilaterally stopped all testing, that the Soviet Union has offered time and again a nuclear freeze. There are many things about the Soviet proposals that your average and not-so-average viewer or reader in the West doesn't know. And I think one of the reasons is precisely because these Soviet views, offers, positions have not been given a fair account in the Western media and if there's going to be any change after Geneva, positive change, I would very much like to see a more objective and fair coverage of the things coming out of the Soviet Union, especially those relating to East-West relations.

[Gorshkov] In the United States itself, the judgments on the summit's results and future prospects of the arms control are rather contradicting. Does London, being the closest U.S. ally, follow the same pattern in its attitudes to the problem?

[Posner] Well, I have to begin by saying that I am really not an expert on the UK. As you know, my field is more the United States of America, but I would tend to think that there also must be a bit of contradiction in the judgments and in the analysis of what will happen.

I don't think it's easy for any prominent politician in the West today to totally play down the results of the summit. I believe a lot of them are paying the summit lip service because that's what you have to do if you want to have some kind of popularity, because the man in the street does support it. However, I have a very strong feeling that there are people in the UK as well as in the United States in government circles who will try to do whatever they can to subvert the summit, to spoil the atmosphere. We've already seen this, as a matter of fact, in the states. There have been statements to that effect by Mr Weinberger, by Richard Perle. There have been articles in the press by certain senators, again aimed at -- what I would say -- poisoning the atmosphere. And I think that you will have the same kind of situation in the UK because there are definitely people who have a vested interest in keeping relations bad instead of having an improvement.

[Gorshkov] Well, if we take official assessments, the prime minister, for example, has praised the summit as a constructive dialogue providing for a speedup of the arms control talks. But isn't London itself impeding the progress in Geneva by joining the U.S. "star wars" project? After all, as the SUNDAY TIMES considered, the SDI is the biggest stumbling block on the Geneva road and it has to be removed. Now what do you think, Vladimir? Does this understanding reflect the general line of thinking on the questions of war and peace in Britain?

[Posner] Again, it's difficult to make a judgment on the basis of 8 days in a country that one doesn't know all that much. But I will give you my impressions. My impressions are that the average man in the street is not really much of a supporter of SDI. And I also felt quite a lot of anti-American sentiment. However, I want to make this quite clear: not anti-American in the broad sense, but anti-Reagan sentiment. I did feel a lot of that when I was in Scotland and in England. And I think it's perfectly true that SDI is indeed the major stumbling block along the way to any agreement in the area of arms reduction. This has been very clearly stated by the Soviet side. What I fear is that once again the media have not really explained the "star wars" idea to the population. When I was there, I had to repeat time and time again why the Soviet Union was so much against the whole concept of "star wars," the fact that there can be no shield that is stronger than a sword and therefore the idea of this being a foolproof shield is simply not true. The fact that it is a first-strike capability, making it possible to protect your own silos, your own missiles, have a first strike, weaken the other side's ability to retaliate, and then serve as shield against a weakened retaliation -- this is something that most people are really not aware of. So, what I think is happening in the UK is, there is an almost -- how should I put it? -- gut reaction to SDI as being negative, as being something that will spoil arms reduction talks. But I also feel that the government -- the UK government -- is indeed impeding arms reduction by supporting that whole idea of SDI, yes indeed.

[Gorshkov] You have mentioned the man in the street. We've been talking about the press coverage of an event that is most vital for world peace. But I hope you'll agree that the thing no less vital for the prospects of arms control is public opinion, the people's desire for peace. Judging by your phone-ins with British listeners -- I understand you had some -- and judging by your other encounters with people in UK, what's your impression of the British man in the street's attitude to the problems discussed in Geneva? What was expected from the summit by the people, and how this summit and its results are assessed? [as heard]

[Posner] I feel most people were very happy with the summit, with what happened, and I have to say that the mass media, television in particular, gave a positive image of a new atmosphere, of a fresh start, of an improvement in relations. And I have no doubt that the average citizen of the United Kingdom is very much relieved, very much supports it, and they do expect some very important changes.



They would like to see -- there's no doubt about this -- some real Soviet-U.S. agreements in the area of arms control and arms reduction. However, as I say this, I recall a question that I was asked when I participated in one of these television programs, this one being "Open to Question," which involved children aged 14 to 17 from schools all over the UK, and one young gentleman asked me: Due to the slightly trigger-finger approach of the United States, do you think it's possible that there be a Soviet-UK alliance in the close future? And I thought that was a rather interesting question in that it perhaps reflected a certain sentiment that the UK and the Soviet Union should deal more directly with one another without going through a third party, in this case, the United States. And, without going overboard on this one, I also think it does reflect a certain sentiment, a desire on the part of the British people to have normal relations with our country and that certainly does fully correspond to the desire that we have.

[Gorshkov] Thank you Vladimir Posner.

#### NATO Socialist Parties Issue Communiqué

LD291837 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 29 Nov 85

[Text] Bonn, November 29 TASS -- "The positive climate in which the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was held is promising constructive relations between the Soviet Union and the United States in the future," points out a communiqué of the conference of representatives of the Social Democratic and Socialist Parties of NATO countries. The conference has come to a close in Bonn. "Therefore special importance is being attached to securing that the impulse which was given by the summit towards achieving progress does not lose intensity as a result of the lack of new initiatives which could have led to mutually beneficial accords," emphasizes the communiqué which was introduced to a press conference here today. The participants in the conference called on the leadership of the USSR and the USA to respect the obligations arising from joint accords, including the SALT-1 and SALT-2 treaties as well as the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limiting of anti-ballistic missile systems, and to adhere to the strict interpretation of its provisions.

"The USSR and the USA," the communiqué says, "should agree on ways for radical cut-backs in strategic arms concerning both the launching systems and warheads, ban the testing and development of anti-missile and anti-satellite systems and to abandon preparations for transferring the arms race to outer space". The communiqué urges the two sides to reach unity of views on the question of a moratorium on tests of nuclear weapons and to strive for the conclusion of a treaty next year to ban any nuclear explosions.

The vital interests of Western Europe in matters of security and disarmament urgently require that the governments use all their influence to make the current talks more productive and to prevent a further intensification of the arms race which is to the detriment of European security, the participants in the conference maintain, addressing the leaders of the countries of this part of the world.

The governments of West European countries, the communique stresses, should come forward with their own initiatives with a view to achieving concrete results at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms, at the Vienna talks on Mutual Reduction of the Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe, as well as at the Stockholm Conference on Security- and Confidence-building Measures and on Disarmament in Europe. West European countries should strive for an active dialogue with Eastern countries in order to reach mutual understanding in the solution of security problems.

"The development of new weapon systems poses a threat to stability and brings with it new still more complex problems for East-West security. It is essential to prevent the spreading of the arms race to outer space as a result of realisation of the U.S. 'Strategic Defense Initiative' (SDI) and other projects," the communique points out.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1176

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### WEST PROPOSES TROOP WITHDRAWALS AT MBFR TALKS

PM051551 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 5 Dec 85 p 4

[Report by diplomatic correspondent David Adamson: "British Plan To End Deadlock in Vienna Troop Cut Talks"]

[Text] NATO will attempt to break the deadlock in the Vienna troop reduction talks today with a set of British-initiated proposals aimed primarily at building a new confidence and trust between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The numbers of troops involved in what is described as an interim proposal are small: 5,000 American and 11,500 Soviet troops.

They would be withdrawn in the space of one year from the "reduction area" comprising West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

During this period and for a further two years both sides would agree not to increase their forces. They would in addition accept a package of measures enabling each side to monitor and verify the other's compliance with the agreement.

It would mean setting up a number of monitoring posts at agreed airfields, seaports and frontier posts. These would be the only places where American and Soviet troops would be allowed to enter and leave.

The Vienna talks have made practically no progress since they began in 1973, largely because the West does not believe Soviet figures of its force strength and there is no way of verifying them.

Today's proposal avoids this problem by suggesting that each side's figures be accepted and used as a benchmark to measure future force levels.

NATO estimates that there are 1.2 million Soviet ground and Air Force personnel in the Warsaw Pact half of the "reduction area" and one million in the NATO half.

The new proposal, which will be tabled by the British ambassador in Vienna, Mr Michael Alexander, was drafted with the help of the West Germans and the backing of the United States. It attempts to bring together various ideas which have emerged from past American and Soviet proposals.

The latest Western proposals are being presented at the end of the current negotiating session, which will give the Soviet Union the Christmas recess in which to digest them before talks resume at the end of next month.

/8309

CSO: 5300/2542

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S., NEW ZEALAND CLASH OVER NUCLEAR POLICY

### New Zealand Draft Bill

LD282202 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 28 Nov 85

[Text] Canberra, November 28 TASS -- New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange has submitted to the ministers-parliament members a draft bill formalizing his government's ban on calls of nuclear-powered or nuclear-armed ships at the ports of the country. Lange said that draft legislation reaffirmed New Zealand's generally negative attitude to Washington's refusal to supply information on the presence of nuclear weapons aboard U.S. ships asking permission for entry in New Zealand ports. At the same time, according to the prime minister, draft legislation had been somewhat revised to alleviate tension in relations with the United States.

The Lange government offered Washington jointly to discuss those stipulations of the new draft bill which were relevant to relations between the two countries. American officials, however, refused even to meet New Zealand representatives. Carrying on its tactic of pressuring the New Zealand Government, the American side made it clear that the new draft legislation could only lead to the denial of the status of "allied state" to New Zealand and threatened that the United States would withdraw from the ANZUS bloc, of which New Zealand and Australia as well as the USA are members.

### U.S. Reaction

LD291042 Moscow TASS in English 0923 GMT 29 Nov 85

[Text] New York, November 29 TASS -- The Washington administration has notified New Zealand's Government that the United States would abrogate the allied treaty with it if New Zealand passed the law to prohibit entries of nuclear-capable warships into its waters, the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES reports today with reference to "high placed officials". News analysts regard that demarche on the part of Washington as an attempt to exert pressure upon New Zealand's Government to make it give up its anti-nuclear policy.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1174

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: PACIFIC COUNTRIES OPPOSE FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS

LD261124 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 25 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, 25 Nov (TASS)--TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev writes:

According to reports in New Zealand, France has carried out the latest underground nuclear test on the Mururoa Atoll, in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean. This is the seventh underground nuclear explosion this year, and according to the data of the "Defense Monitor" bulletin published in the United States by the Center for Defense Information, France has exploded 127 nuclear devices of military designation since 1960.

The statement by New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange stresses that the population of the southern part of the Pacific resolutely and in no uncertain terms censures the French nuclear explosions in the region. In Australia Foreign Minister William Hayden has stated that France is continuing to ignore the opinion of the countries of the southern part of the Pacific which have come out against nuclear explosions in region.

As is well known, these countries worked out and approved an agreement proclaiming the southern part of the Pacific a non-nuclear zone at the 16th session of the forum of states from the southern part of the Pacific in August this year.

Among the initiators of this resolution was the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, striving to put an end to the madness of the nuclear arms race. The vast majority of members of the First Committee voted for the given resolution and only the United States, Britain, and France voted against. Evidently the ruling circles of these countries can still not give up the old way of thinking: allegedly the more nuclear weapons, the more secure is peace. Life convincingly refutes the untenability of such views, for the unrestrained stockpiling of nuclear weapons only strengthens the danger of a catastrophe. This is why now, in the nuclear age, we need a new approach, a new view which presupposes not only a realization of the disastrous consequences of a nuclear war and the danger of the arms race in general. This race undermines the stability of international peace and brings the threat of nuclear war closer.

The concern of the countries of the southern part of the Pacific at the nuclear explosions which are continuing in their region is understandable to the Soviet Union. For any program of tests is preparation for war. The Soviet Union is in favor of an urgent end to [sentence incomplete as received]

/8309

CSO: 5200/1174



## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### MOSCOW NOTES NORDIC FREE-ZONE CONFERENCE

#### 'Majority Support'

LD272007 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1700 GMT 26 Nov85

[From "The World Today" program: Yuriy Aleksandrov commentary entitled "Nuclear Weapons and Nuclear Weapons-Free Strategy"]

[Text] In a few days' time Nordic parliamentarians will gather in Christiansborg Palace in Copenhagen to discuss the question of a nuclear-free north. The meeting of the parliamentarians is a realistic possibility for bringing the countries' stances closer to each other on the question of the nuclear-free zone. Apparently these days many inhabitants of the Nordic countries are thinking about the question of what to do in order to promote the zone plan.

I have read Nordic newspapers which contain alarming facts. In a recent NATO military exercise in Norway the defense of Norway was practiced with the aid of American nuclear weapons. There are several such plans for defending Norway with nuclear weapons. They comprise, among other things, the deployment of nuclear mines in the mountain areas, a nuclear attack from the Norwegian fjords and much else, of which the Norwegians have no idea; even if they find out about it. They do so only as an accomplished fact. In any case, American nuclear ships are cruising in Norwegian waters.

In Sweden it is presumed that (?U.S. naval) strategy will take into account Sweden's neutrality. This was the idea also of a Swedish journalist before his visit to the U.S. Griffiss Air Force base outside New York. The Americans proudly showed him B-52 bombers, ready for flight, with their nuclear missiles. The Swedish visitor was told that the task of the bombers was to arrive at the Norwegian Sea. From there the missiles would be launched in the direction of the Kola Peninsula, Leningrad or Moscow. Naturally, via Sweden, explained the uniformed guide of the U.S. Air Force.

President Urho Kekkonen spoke as early as 1978 about the nuclear-free zone. Having in mind cruise missiles, he said: These missiles, as opposed to the present intercontinental missiles, might turn the use of the airspace of countries outside the conflict and of neutral countries into an everyday matter. And the possibility of the use of cruise missiles threatens to draw into the conflict states which are not involved in it.

And now from facts to the presentation of assessments. Speaking at the international peace university in Aarhus last October, Oslo University Professor Erik Alfsen noted the following: We have become accustomed to speaking about the north as a militarily peaceful area. But during the past 5 or 6 years there has been military activity in our area on a scale comparable only to war preparations. It is for this reason that the majority of the people in the Nordic countries support a nuclear-free north.

The Soviet Union is the only nuclear power which has a common border with the Nordic countries and which is prepared to give guarantees for a nuclear-free zone to be established there. In addition the Soviet Union is prepared to discuss some measures on its own territory adjoining the zone and to discuss with interested parties the question of a nuclear-free status of the Baltic.

#### Conference Opens

OW011404 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Nov 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast; commentary by V. Kondratyev]

[Text] A conference of parliamentarians of northern European countries opened in Copenhagen today to discuss the issue of creating a nuclear-free zone in the region.

[Kondratyev] Hello comrades The idea of declaring the northern part of our continent a nuclear-free zone is not new. It had already been advanced by Finnish President Kekkonen in 1963 and has been discussed many times by political and public circles. But never before has such great attention been paid to this problem as now. The reason for this is first of all, the continued deployment of U.S. first strike missiles in Europe. Strategists in the Pentagon lay the flight trajectories of these missiles on their maps, in the case of so-called crisis situations, over the territory of northern Europe. The people of countries situated here justifiably view such Pentagon actions as a direct threat to their security. Indicative are the public opinion polls. Over 90 percent of the Finns, 86 percent of the Icelanders, 80 percent of the Swedes, and a clear majority of Danes and Norwegians favor nuclear-free status. Yet despite this great support, including support in the governments of the navies of these countries the idea of a nuclear-free north is not being implemented. Washington and its closest NATO allies obstruct in every way the implementation of this proposal as it contradicts the strategic concept of the NATO military alliance. Washington is not at all concerned by the fact that this negative position contradicts the peaceful aspirations of the people. The Soviet Union has repeatedly pointed out its readiness to be the guarantor of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe.

On the eve of the conference in Copenhagen, prominent leaders of political parties of Finland appealed to the Nordic countries' governments to intensify actions for creating a nuclear-free zone. This would be a step on the path of toward completely freeing the continent from nuclear arms. All those who cherish peace expect that this appeal will find a positive response.

Socialist Parties' Communique

LD011357 Moscow TASS in English 1209 GMT 1 Dec 85

[Text] Copenhagen, December 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent V. Loskutov reports: A two-day conference of the MPs of the Nordic countries on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe has closed here. The forum was attended by more than 100 MPs representing nearly 50 political parties of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Greenland, the Faroe and Aland Islands.

The participants in the conference have discussed a broad range of issues in connection with the problem of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the region. Addressing the conference, Finnish MPs, representatives of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Sweden, opposition parties of Denmark and Norway stressed that the turning of the European north into a nuclear-free zone would be an important step on the way towards ensuring an atmosphere of trust in Europe and delivering the whole of the continent from nuclear weapons.

After closing the debate, the socio-democratic parties of the Nordic countries have issued a joint statement saying that their parties will "undertake an initiative to set up an interparliamentary working group, which will in the future work on problems in connection with the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe." The statement also calls on the governments of the countries of the region to set up a common north European group at the governmental level, which will, in cooperation with the interparliamentary working group, attend to issues pertaining to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe.

The socio-democratic parties of the countries of the region have expressed the wish to hold in the future a new conference on the problems pertaining to the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the European north.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1174

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

02 Jan. 1986